# ACQUISITION. TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS

#### THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

## 3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

APR 19 2004

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney President of the Senate Washington DC 20510

Dear Mr. President:

The Department of Defense is pleased to present to Congress the Fiscal Year 2003 Defense Environmental Restoration Program report. This report is submitted pursuant to, Section 2706 of Title 10, and Sections 9620(e)(5) and 9621(c) of Title 42, United States Code. This report describes the Department's accomplishments and plans for fulfilling commitments to protect human health and the environment by completing its environmental restoration program responsibilities.

The Defense Environmental Restoration Program addresses environmental impacts from past defense activities at over 30,000 sites on approximately 11,000 military installations and former properties in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories. As detailed in the report, the Department made significant progress in our environmental restoration program in Fiscal Year 2003. As of September 30, 2003, the Department had completed cleanup activities to Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act requirements at 70 percent of its sites and former properties.

The Department appreciates the continued support of the Congress for this program. A similar letter has been sent to the Speaker of the House and the appropriate congressional defense committees.

Sincerely,

Acting

Enclosure: As stated





# **CONTENTS**

The Defense Environmental Restoration Program	
Component Restoration Status and Progress	
Army	39
Navy/Marine Corps	45
Air Force	51
Defense Logistics Agency	57
Formerly Used Defense Sites	63
Appendices	
Appendix A: Installation Narrative Summaries	A-1
Appendix B: Installation Restoration Program Status Tables	B-1
Appendix C: Military Munitions Response Program Status Tables	C-1
Appendix D: Environmental Condition of BRAC Property	D-1
Appendix E: Cost Recovery Status	E-1
Appendix F: References	F-1
Appendix G: Index	G-1



# THE DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROGRAM

"If the Department of Defense is to prepare for the security challenges of the 21st century, we must transform not just our defense strategies, our military capabilities, and the way we deter and defend, but also the way we conduct our daily business. Transformation is not an event—it is a process."

#### **Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense**

May 14, 2003

In fulfilling our mission to protect and defend the United States and the American people, the Department of Defense (DoD) manages over 30 million acres of land and hundreds of installations and facilities essential to military operations and training. As a responsible steward of public lands, DoD, through the Defense Environmental Response Program (DERP), restores property that has been environmentally impacted by past defense activities. The DERP addresses environmental restoration at over 30,000 sites at active and closing military installations, as well as formerly used defense sites (FUDS), across the nation and the U.S. territories.

As the Department transforms its structure and practices to face new defense mission challenges, so too must DoD's environmental restoration program. Sound stewardship remains the primary program driver and a focus on improved environmental restoration methods affects increased cleanup success. Cleaning up contamination from past activities protects both military personnel and the public from environmental health and safety hazards, and sustaining the land DoD holds in the public trust preserves our ability to train our forces effectively. DoD demonstrates its commitment to environmental restoration by supporting and maintaining a risk-based environmental restoration program, which consistently demonstrates measurable progress, is increasingly transparent to stakeholders and the public, and evolves to accurately address current and future risks posed by contamination. To remain successful, the DERP must continually transform in response to emerging environmental challenges, while maximizing the use of limited resources to address contamination most efficiently.



....



## **DERP History**

Prior to the mid-1970s the environmental impacts of common manufacturing and disposal practices were not well known or understood. The government and private industry historically managed and disposed of hazardous substances and wastes using practices later found to be detrimental to the environment.

Before the adoption of any Federal requirements or programs, DoD recognized the impacts of its activities on the environment and began identifying, characterizing, and addressing environmental contamination at its installations in 1975. Growing public concern and increased knowledge about the environment led Congress to pass the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) in 1980. CERCLA, also known as Superfund, established a requirement and a framework for the identification, investigation, and cleanup of hazardous substances resulting from past practices. Congress amended CERCLA in 1986, creating the DERP and its budgetary funding mechanism, the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA).

Beginning in the late 1980s, Congress acted to eliminate excess military infrastructure by authorizing four rounds of base realignment and closure (BRAC) in 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995. Congress approved a new round of BRAC in 2005 to further streamline and modernize DoD's infrastructure. Of the almost 500 installations that closed or were realigned since 1988, 208 installations required some type of environmental remediation. Through the DERP, DoD addresses contamination at BRAC installations to ensure that property being transferred is safe for reuse.

## **Program Overview**

Today, the ecological and health concerns associated with environmental contamination are much better understood than when the program began in 1975. The DERP is now a robust program addressing a wide range of environmental issues at thousands of diverse sites. To most effectively address the different kinds of contaminants likely to impact DoD installations and former properties, the Department organized the DERP into three program categories:

- ▶ Installation Restoration Program (IRP)—The IRP category addresses releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants that pose toxicological risks. Used at installations for 18 years, this program category operates using wellestablished procedures to fulfill environmental restoration requirements.
- Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)—The MMRP category addresses environmental health and safety hazards from unexploded ordnance (UXO), discarded military munitions, and munitions constituents. Incidental to hazardous waste remediation, a limited number of hazards associated with military munitions were addressed under the IRP. DoD created the MMRP category in Fiscal Year 2001 (FY2001) to more completely address potential hazards remaining from its past use of military munitions.
- Building Demolition/Debris Removal (BD/DR)—The BD/DR category provides for the demolition and removal of unsafe buildings or structures. DoD conducts a small number of activities in this program category, primarily at FUDS properties.



Under these program categories, DoD addresses contamination at three types of property: active installations; BRAC installations; and FUDS, which are properties DoD formerly owned, leased, or operated. The Military Components—the Army, Navy, Air Force, Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), and Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA)—implement the DERP, with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) providing program oversight. Within OSD, the Environmental Management Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment has responsibility for overseeing and reporting on the DERP.

DoD built and maintains a successful program by focusing on reducing the health and safety risks posed by historical contamination. The Department employs a risk-based management strategy and cleanup approach for the DERP with three main elements: implementing a systematic process for prioritizing sites and executing restoration activity based on the relative risk posed to human health and the environment; developing program goals and performance metrics to drive restoration activities, secure funding, and track overall program progress in reducing risk; and working with regulators and communities to address stakeholder concerns. These key elements are discussed throughout this chapter.

## The Environmental Restoration Process

DoD conducts environmental restoration activities through a well-planned, carefully implemented, outcome-driven process. Since DoD installations and properties vary greatly in size and function, and generally contain relatively small areas of localized contamination, DoD defines discrete parcels of contaminated property to provide the Department with a more effective approach to cleanup. These specific areas of contamination are called "sites." DoD tracks and manages the DERP on a site-by-site basis and uses site-level data to identify and conduct response action requirements, maintain a complete site-level inventory, implement a risk-based management strategy, and track overall program progress in reducing risk. Building the program on a site basis increases the accuracy of DoD's environmental restoration information and enables more specific long-term planning and budgeting to meet site requirements.

## **CERCLA Cleanup Process**

While only required for sites on the National Priorities List (NPL), the Department chose to follow the environmental restoration process set by CERCLA and its implementing regulation, the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), for all restoration sites, including those under its MMRP, regardless of their NPL status. This process consists of several phases, illustrated in Figure 1 and described below. While some phases may overlap or occur concurrently, environmental response activities at DoD sites are generally conducted in the order shown. DoD demonstrates program progress as sites move from investigation through the cleanup phases to complete all restoration requirements. DoD's outcome-driven process focuses on meeting environmental restoration requirements and protecting human health and the environment at every site.

### Investigation

When contamination is suspected at a site, DoD begins the investigation process by conducting a preliminary assessment, a limited investigation involving document reviews, visual site






FIGURE 1: ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROCESS PHASES AND MILESTONES

inspections, and interviews to assess whether or not a contaminant release may have occurred at the site. DoD collects additional information during the next phase, the site inspection, to determine whether further environmental restoration activities are required. If preliminary assessment and site inspection findings indicate that the site needs further investigation, DoD performs a remedial investigation, which involves more comprehensive data collection, such as analyzing soil and groundwater samples. Using the investigation results from the remedial investigation phase, DoD conducts a feasibility study to examine the merits of various cleanup options and determine the best practical strategy for remediation.

The major milestone in the investigation portion of the environmental restoration process, which marks the end of investigation activity, is the Record of Decision (ROD) or equivalent decision document. In the ROD, DoD documents the results of DoD's investigation at the site, the selected remediation strategy, and planned objectives for the site. If DoD determines that the site poses no risk to human health or the environment, the ROD documents that no further action will be taken and all environmental restoration requirements are fulfilled.

#### Cleanup

If investigation indicates that remediation is required, then the site progresses to the cleanup phases of the environmental restoration process, during which the specific remedy, or cleanup method, chosen for the site and documented in the ROD, is implemented. Cleanup actions may include designing, constructing, or operating a remedy, which are addressed in the cleanup process during the remedial design, remedial action construction, and remedial action operation phases, respectively. Remedial activities continue until the cleanup objectives stated in the ROD are met. For sites where the selected remedy allows contamination to remain on







**AIR FORCE** 

# Innovative Cleanup Strategy Saves Hangar Project at McGuire Air Force Base

DoD promotes the use of more effective strategies for addressing environmental contamination. One strategy is a new cleanup paradigm based on the use of an integrated triad of systematic planning, dynamic work plans, and real-time measurement for data collection and technical decision-making at sites. This approach emphasizes overall decision quality and more efficient and effective cleanup in accordance with the planned property reuse.

When groundwater contamination threatened to derail construction of an aircraft hangar crucial to the deployment of C-17 Globemaster cargo planes, the Air Force faced a formidable task: keep the \$28 million C-17 MILCON project on schedule and still meet environmental cleanup requirements.

The chlorinated solvent PCE (tetrachloroethylene) was found in shallow groundwater under the hangar site at concentrations high enough to require an immediate stop-work order. This situation typically takes several years of site analysis and regulatory processes to resolve, but the C-17 Globemasters would arrive at their new home on McGuire Air Force Base in less than one year. There was not enough time to follow traditional environmental restoration processes, but there was a solution.

McGuire environmental restoration leaders turned to a new, EPA-approved approach to cleanup. Called the Triad approach for its three-fold process in evaluating cleanup sites, this method has won accolades from environmental restoration experts as a faster and better way of doing business. Key elements that give the Triad approach its edge:

- · Emphasizing up-front planning to concentrate on likely areas of contamination
- · Trading the standard off-site analysis for a much faster "in-the-field" analysis
- Using data generated in the field to determine testing hot spots, and what and where to test for next.

The approach works in part because new technologies enable a higher sampling rate over a greater area during a shorter period of time. When environmental restoration teams use the Triad approach, site evaluation takes place over the course of a few days instead of several months.

At McGuire Air Force Base, the site analysis team sampled soil and groundwater in 108 locations and conducted more than 600 lab tests in just 14 days. They mapped the PCE groundwater plume, determined the source of the contamination, and confirmed that over time, natural ecological processes were neutralizing and diluting the PCE. The core technical team developed a plan for addressing contamination at the site, centering on removing 500 cubic yards of soil and installing 12 wells to ensure that PCE levels continued to drop.

Within six months of the PCE detection, construction of the C-17 hangar was back on schedule. Using the TRIAD approach, McGuire officials estimate they saved more than \$37 million on environmental restoration activity, and nearly \$1.34 million on the construction of the hangar.



When contamination is suspected at a site, DoD begins the investigation process by conducting a preliminary assessment, a limited investigation involving document reviews, visual site tg as designed and that any necessary operation and maintenance activities are taking place.

There are two important milestones during the cleanup phases of the restoration process, both of which indicate site progress. The remedy-in-place (RIP) milestone marks the point at which DoD has implemented the chosen remedy, and the remedy is operating properly and successfully. When all cleanup objectives for a site are met, the second milestone, response complete (RC), is reached. After reaching the RC milestone, the site may require long-term management (LTM) activities, such as five-year reviews, monitoring, and maintenance of a remedial action, to ensure the established remedy continues to meet the objectives prescribed in the ROD.

#### Site Prioritization

The DERP is a complex environmental program with more than 30,000 sites. Although DoD will address all sites, DoD is not able to remediate every site simultaneously. This means that careful consideration and planning are required to prioritize sites so that resources are utilized efficiently to maximize reduction in risk and progress toward environmental restoration goals. As a risk-based program, the DERP goals are designed to help DoD reduce risk and complete restoration requirements on a worst-first basis, meaning that sites that pose the greatest risk to human health and the environment take precedence. DoD uses prioritization tools to determine the risk posed by each site relative to other sites in the inventory so that funding can be allocated to achieve the greatest risk reduction. DoD uses the Relative-Risk Site Evaluation (RRSE) framework to prioritize sites in the IRP and is developing a site prioritization protocol for MMRP sites.

#### IRP Site Prioritization

DoD developed the RRSE to systematically prioritize IRP sites based on each site's potential risk relative to all other sites in the IRP. Using the RRSE, DoD ranks sites as high, medium, or low relative-risk based on the nature and extent of contamination at a site, the potential for contaminants to migrate, and the populations and ecosystems that could be impacted. The Department also considers other factors in sequencing sites for cleanup, such as installation cleanup strategy, progress toward program goals, and stakeholder concerns. The IRP's environmental restoration goals are directly linked to the RRSE framework, focusing on addressing sites in higher risk categories first.

In the RRSE, sites can also be designated as Not Evaluated or Not Required. The Not Evaluated designation is for sites that have not been investigated thoroughly enough to determine a relative-risk ranking. The Not Required category includes sites that have already achieved RIP or RC, as well as IRP sites requiring only military munitions response, building demolition and debris removal, or actions where a party other than DoD is responsible for cleanup.

The RRSE is a consideration in the prioritization of BRAC sites as well; however, an important objective at BRAC installations is to support reuse by making property environmentally suitable for transfer in accordance with CERCLA requirements. This means reuse needs and priorities, as well as property transfer and redevelopment plans, are major drivers in sequencing cleanup activity at BRAC installations, along with relative risk.



#### **FOCUS ON THE FIELD**




NAVY

## Early Transfer in California Makes Good Business Sense

Early transfer authority offers DoD the option of transferring property by deed while environmental restoration work is in progress. This statutory waiver of property transfer restrictions provides economic and environmental benefits to communities and DoD by integrating cleanup and redevelopment, remediating to levels based on consideration of future land use, increasing opportunities for investment, expediting property reuse, and relieving DoD's property management responsibilities.

The Navy had almost 500 acres of land it no longer needed on Rough and Ready Island at the Naval Computer and Telecommunications Installation, Stockton and the Port of Stockton, California, wanted it as soon as possible. Before a land transfer could take place, however, the Navy had to ensure the cleanup of chemical contamination at the installation.



An aerial view of the Port of Stockton development area.

The property, contaminated with waste oils, pesticides, and solvents, required environmental cleanup that could potentially take 15 years to complete. This was too long to wait for the Port of Stockton, which was currently pushing forward with a massive business expansion.

The Port's planned commercial development would position it as the third largest port in California and maintain its status as the largest inland port west of the Mississippi River. Economists projected that the expansion would bring more than 550 new jobs, \$50 million in economic output, and nearly \$20 million in new income to the area, but the plan depended on the full acquisition of Rough and Ready Island.

The Navy, wanting to support the local community and shed the costly excess property, decided to pursue an early transfer. An early transfer enables the Navy to transfer

ownership of the land to the Port of Stockton prior to completion

of cleanup, with the assurance that the cleanup process would continue and appropriate safeguards are in place to ensure public health and safety. Until now, the early transfer authority had only been used at base realignment and closure installations, making this the first-ever early transfer at an active installation.

To ensure the timely transfer of the land, the Navy and the Port worked collaboratively to agree on details of the cleanup, which the Port would complete. The Navy and the Port also coordinated closely with federal and state regulators, as well as the governor, to gain approval of the plan.

It was a deal that benefited everyone—the Navy could complete the property transfer to the local community and save time and money, and the Port of Stockton could obtain the land it needed, finalize the cleanup, and pursue its business expansion. The parties sealed the deal in September 2003, approximately two years after initial discussions began.



#### · MMRP Site Prioritization

When DoD established the MMRP in September 2001 to address hazards remaining from past use of military munitions, it adopted the Risk Assessment Code as an interim DoD-wide tool to prioritize MMRP sites. The Risk Assessment Code evaluates the risk posed by UXO and discarded military munitions at a site based on the potential explosive safety hazards present. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers adopted the Risk Assessment Code's procedure as the interim approach because of its longstanding use in prioritizing UXO cleanup at FUDS sites. The Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol, which is currently under development, will soon replace the Risk Assessment Code as the standard for assigning relative priorities to MMRP sites.

In an effort to fulfill statutory requirements established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, DoD began developing a proposed protocol for assigning a relative priority to each site in the MMRP. The proposed Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol assigns a relative priority to each site based primarily on an evaluation of three types of hazards:

- Explosive hazards posed by UXO and discarded military munitions
- Hazards associated with the effects of chemical warfare materiel
- Chronic health and environmental hazards posed by munitions constituents or other chemical constituents.

In addition, other factors such as economic, programmatic, and stakeholder concerns may impact sequencing decisions.

DoD published the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol as a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* on August 22, 2003, with a 90-day public comment period. DoD will consider all comments submitted in finalizing the prioritization protocol. Upon completion, the prioritization protocol will be applied to all sites listed in DoD's MMRP site inventory and will be used as the basis for DoD's MMRP risk management strategy. As DoD finalizes the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol and applies it to the MMRP inventory, the Department will continue to build MMRP goals and metrics to ensure continued progress.

## **Program Performance Goals**

To keep the DERP on track and measure progress, DoD developed program goals and performance metrics that measure progress toward the goals. These program goals are results-oriented, focusing on moving sites through the environmental restoration process. DoD's risk-based program goals guide the Components' investment decisions and set targets for the Components in planning and executing environmental restoration activities. The Department endeavors to achieve these goals by leveraging regulatory partnerships and planning, managing, and budgeting to ensure sufficient funding is available to support environmental restoration plans and projections.

### IRP Performance Goals

DoD's IRP program goals at active installations and FUDS properties set milestones for putting remedies in place and completing cleanup requirements so that risks to human health and the environment are reduced. At active installations with sites in the IRP, the remaining goals are to have remedies in place or achieve response complete at:



- All high relative-risk sites by the end of FY2007
- All medium relative-risk sites by the end of FY2011
- All remaining sites by the end of FY2014.

Properties in the FUDS program have the same goals for high and medium relative-risk sites, but with FY2020 as the goal for all remaining sites. DoD achieved its FY2002 goal of reaching RIP or RC at 50 percent of its high relative-risk sites.

BRAC installation IRP goals differ from those for active installations or FUDS. BRAC IRP site cleanup focuses on putting remedies in place and completing all response action so that property is ready for transfer and reuse. To this end, DoD is working to achieve RIP or RC at 100 percent of its BRAC sites and installations by the end of FY2005. In addition, by FY2005 DoD aims to have 100 percent of BRAC acreage ready for transfer as defined by CERCLA requirements.

#### **MMRP Performance Goals**

Since DoD is still building the MMRP, the Department first developed near-term goals focused on completing initial investigation activities at MMRP sites. The completion of the initial investigation phases of the restoration process will allow DoD to more accurately characterize each MMRP site and facilitate the prioritization of sites. After the prioritization protocol is finalized and applied to MMRP sites, DoD will further develop and implement program goals and performance metrics to move MMRP cleanup forward. In the interim, DoD has developed the following near-term MMRP goals:

- For all MMRP sites at active installations and FUDS properties, complete a preliminary assessment by the end of FY2007 and complete site inspection by the end of FY2010.
- ► For all MMRP sites at installations currently in the BRAC program, achieve RIP or RC at all MMRP sites by the end of FY2009.

DoD is using its MMRP goals to plan and budget for its munitions response requirements. DoD continues to build on the MMRP framework already in place by refining the inventory of MMRP sites and finalizing the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol. In the coming years, DoD will use experience gained in the IRP to ensure the MMRP meets all munitions response challenges.

## FY2003 Program Progress

The Department uses an electronic database of site inventories to track program progress by environmental restoration phase (e.g., investigation, cleanup, long-term management) and risk category. DoD uses this phase information to evaluate the status and progress of the program toward DERP goals. DoD uses several well-established metrics to monitor the progress of IRP sites as they advance through the environmental restoration process and is working to develop metrics for the MMRP.

FISCAL YEAR 2003





ARMY

# Creative "Farming" Cleans Up Contamination and Reduces Project Costs

Innovation in restoration practices means more effective and efficient cleanup. DoD investigates emerging technologies and their applications for improving the cleanup process and meeting cleanup standards, as well as accelerating project schedules and reducing overall cleanup costs. Field-testing new technologies and cleanup methods paves the way for broader implementation of these practices.

When cleanup technology experts at Watervliet Arsenal in New York mention land farming they aren't referring to crops or livestock. They're talking about a soil cleanup technology that uses naturally occurring microorganisms to chemically break down contaminants. The technique



An Eliminator mixes contaminated soll and microbecontaining soil to facilitate soil cleanup.

involves mixing contaminated soil with soil containing specific microbes. Regular tilling aerates the soil, creating a favorable environment for the bacteria, which then adsorb and process the chemicals.

Historical activities at Watervliet, the nation's oldest continuously operating cannon manufacturing plant, included storage of spent solvents and waste oils. Site investigations in the 1990s revealed polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and heavy metals in arsenal soil.

The impressive results from a successful

2001 pilot study conducted under the direction of the US Army Corps of Engineers quickly made land farming the approach of choice for remediating soil contamination at a 15-acre site at the Watervliet Arsenal.

Regulators approved a full-scale design to treat 20,000 cubic yards of soil at the Siberia Area in late FY2002. This land farming pilot study, which began in early FY03, focused on a 16,000-square-foot plot containing 4,000 cubic yards of mixed soil, applied 7 feet deep. The depth of the treated soil—normally only 1 to 2 feet deep in land farming applications—is one of the factors that made the pilot's success so noteworthy. By regularly tilling the land farming area and bringing the lower-depth soil to the surface, a greater amount of contaminated soil was able to be remediated in a smaller amount of space.

The results: total PAH levels dropped by 76 percent.

And the price wasn't bad either. Compared to traditional methods for remediating contaminated soil, such as overexcavation for off-site disposal, land farming cost a third less, resulting in nearly \$500,000 in savings during the pilot study.

Land farming allowed the Army to expedite the treatment of contaminated soil at the lowest cost and with the least distruption to base activities. It is a strategy that would be extremely valuable for other DoD sites facing similar environmental challenges.



## **IRP Site Status and Progress**

DoD uses performance metrics, called measures of merit, to assess progress toward IRP goals. These performance metrics include phase progress at the site level, progress toward achieving RIP and RC at the installation level, and progress in overall relative-risk reduction. DoD examines both status to date and the projection of future progress.

### IRP Site Progress by Phase

The majority of sites in the IRP have moved from the investigation phases toward completion of the response action. Figures 2 and 3 display this trend at active and BRAC installations, respectively, by illustrating a decline in the number of sites in investigation and an increase in the number of sites that have progressed through the cleanup phases to achieve RC. The advancement of sites through the environmental restoration process is evidence that the program is progressing.





FIGURE 2: ACTIVE INSTALLATION IRP SITE PROGRESS OVER TIME





-Figures 4 and 5 highlight the status of IRP sites at active and BRAC installations as of the end of FY2003. These figures illustrate the number of sites in the investigation and cleanup phases of the environmental restoration process, as well as the number of sites that have reached RC through FY2003. DoD continues to make significant progress in increasing the number of sites that have achieved RC. During FY2003 alone, DoD achieved RC at an additional 598 sites at active and BRAC installations (see the FUDS Status and Progress section for FUDS IRP site status). These figures also show that by the end of FY2003 DoD achieved RC at 75 percent of active sites and 78 percent of BRAC sites, and that the Department is steadily moving forward in its commitment to complete environmental restoration actions. In total, DoD has achieved RC at 74 percent of all IRP sites, an increase of 2 percent from FY2002.







FIGURE 5: BRAC INSTALLATION IRP SITE STATUS (As of September 30, 2003)



Total Sites: 4,761


\*Remedy in place (RIP) includes sites where remedial action operations are underway.


Upon completion of investigation at many sites, DoD determines that there is no risk to human health and the environment, and the site is categorized as RC. To date, 82 percent of active installation IRP sites achieving RC have done so through investigation activities only, as shown in Figure 6. The majority of BRAC sites achieving RC have also been completed in this manner, which is evidenced in Figure 7. Figure 8 shows a majority of FUDS IRP sites achieving RC through cleanup. In recent years however, the number of IRP sites achieving RC each year through investigation alone has been decreasing, as DoD is completing its investigation activities and concentrating on cleanup actions. This trend indicates that the DERP has progressed from the earlier investigation phases into the cleanup phases as the program has matured. Those sites not requiring cleanup have been predominantly identified, and what remains requires more extensive environmental restoration work.


Interim actions—whether interim remedial actions, involving implementation of a cleanup remedy, or interim removal actions, where contamination is simply removed from a site—are vital methods of mitigating immediate risks to human health and the environment. These actions are typically short-term, quick responses to eliminate or sufficiently reduce risk to human health and the environment at sites causing an immediate danger. By using interim actions, DoD protects affected communities faster than if the normal cleanup process were implemented. Often these actions reduce risk such that no further action is needed at the site. DoD completes a number


<sup>\*\*</sup>Long-term management (LTM) occurs as a subset of the sites that have achieved response complete.












- FY2000 through FY2002 totals have been updated since the previous Annual Report to reflect new and revised data as of FY2003.
- \*\* Includes 556 IRAs conducted prior to the completion of the studies.
- \*\*\*Includes 363 IRAs conducted prior to the completion of the studies.


of these quick-response actions each year, as needed, to prevent contamination from affecting threatened communities and environments. The cumulative number of interim actions completed through the DERP at active and BRAC installations and FUDS properties are shown in Figures 9, 10, and 11, respectively. As of the end of FY2003, DoD completed 5,885 interim actions to address immediate concerns at IRP sites, including 4,144 at active installations, 1,613 at BRAC installations, and 128 at FUDS properties.


#### IRP Installation Progress

Building the DERP based on site-level data enables the Components to plan environmental restoration activities and budget funding based on the needs of each specific site and the risks they present. Tracking site progress at an installation-level allows the Department to see how cleanup activities are progressing on a larger scale. This is especially important at BRAC installations, where the Department's primary goal is transfer of all excess installation property. To expedite transfer, DoD looks to complete all restoration activities across an installation. Thus, another performance measure DoD uses to gauge progress is the achievement of RIP/RC at the installation and property level. An installation achieves RIP/RC when all sites at the installation or property have remedies in place or have reached RC. This metric is the basis for the environmental restoration goals at BRAC installations.


By the end of FY2003, DoD achieved RIP or RC at 61 percent of its installations and properties. This represents 73 percent of active installations, 68 percent of BRAC installations, and 49 percent of FUDS properties. Figures 12 and 13 display DoD's expected RIP/RC completion







\*FY2000 through FY2002 totals have been updated since the previous Annual Report to reflect new and revised data as of FY2003.



trends for active and BRAC installations (see the FUDS Status and Progress section for FUDS RIP/RC trends). DoD does not anticipate meeting its goal of achieving RIP or RC at 100 percent of BRAC installations by FY2005, as seen in Figure 13. DoD does, however, expect to have achieved RIP or RC at 83 percent of BRAC IRP sites. DoD projects that those installations not achieving RIP/RC by FY2005 will only have one or two sites without remedies in place or completed response actions.

#### IRP Relative-Risk Reduction

Reviewing the number of sites in each relative-risk category is another performance metric DoD uses to measure progress toward program goals. This metric captures the RRSE categories and is the basis of DoD's goals for active installations and FUDS properties. As DoD addresses







FIGURE 13: BRAC INSTALLATIONS ACHIEVING FINAL RIP/RC AT ALL IRP SITES \*

(Cumulative and projected, FY1990 through completion)




\*Does not include MMRP sites

sites, the number of sites in the high, medium, and low relative-risk categories decrease while the number of sites in the Not Required category—those that no longer require a relative-risk ranking—increase, demonstrating progress in risk reduction.

As of FY2002, DoD reduced its inventory of high relative-risk IRP sites at active installations and FUDS properties by 58 percent, exceeding the FY2002 goal of achieving RIP or RC at 50 percent of high-risk sites. In FY2003 alone, DoD reduced the total number of high relative-risk FUDS and active installation sites by 233. DoD's progress in reducing the number of sites in each

FIGURE 14: ACTIVE INSTALLATION AND FUDS PROPERTY RELATIVE-RISK SITE EVALUATION PROGRESS



"The Not Evaluated category includes a large number of FUDS sites that are exclusively associated with aboveground and underground storage tanks; sites requiring Relative-Risk Site Evaluation will be determined after tank removal.

"The Not Required category includes sites that have already achieved RIP or RC, as well as IRP sites requiring only military munitions response, building demolition and debris removal, or potentially responsible party actions.

relative-risk category, particularly the high-risk category, is illustrated in Figure 14. With this progress, DoD is on track to meet its FY2007 goal of achieving RIP or RC at all high relative-risk sites.

In addition to reducing the number of high relative-risk sites, DoD has also been successful in reducing the number of medium and low relative-risk sites. DoD is on track to meet its FY2011 and FY2014 goals of achieving RIP or RC at all medium relative-risk sites and all remaining relative-risk sites, respectively. Additionally, DoD is working to achieve RIP or RC at all remaining relative-risk sites on FUDS properties by the end of FY2020.



## MMRP Site Status and Progress

DoD continues to build the MMRP, and is making progress on all the key program elements, including setting useful program progress goals. DoD developed near-term MMRP goals and is in the process of establishing long-term goals and metrics to measure progress in completing work at MMRP sites. The initial MMRP site inventory was produced in FY2002 and will be updated annually. As the site-level MMRP inventory is updated, sites are prioritized, funding is budgeted, and work is executed, DoD will be better able to further develop appropriate goals and metrics for the MMRP. Having established goals and metrics will, in turn, allow DoD to more accurately budget for and fund MMRP requirements.


### MMRP Site Progress by Phase

During FY2003, DoD further developed its inventory of sites known or suspected to contain UXO, discarded military munitions, or munitions constituents. By the end of FY2003, DoD identified 2,817 sites, an increase of 510 sites from FY2002. DoD anticipated this site increase as part of the MMRP development process; as the Department collects MMRP site information, it is better able to identify discrete areas of contamination and define specific sites within large areas. This enables munitions response action to be more exact and targeted, and thus more efficient.

As is the case in the IRP, MMRP sites are categorized according to their phase status in the response process as of the end of FY2003. Progress is demonstrated as MMRP sites move from investigation through cleanup and achieve categorization as response complete. Since the MMRP is in the early stages of development, the majority of sites are still in the investigation stage. Figures 15 and 16 illustrate the status of sites at active and BRAC installations, respectively (see the FUDS Status and Progress section for FUDS MMRP Site Status).

Munitions response actions have been a part of the DERP for several years, primarily at BRAC installations and FUDS, equipping DoD with a solid experience base for addressing the environmental and safety hazards associated with the past use of military munitions and munitions constituents. As a result, some MMRP sites have already achieved RC at BRAC






\* "Active Installations" refers soley to areas other than operational ranges.

**Total Sites: 850** 

## FIGURE 16: BRAC INSTALLATIONS MMRP. SITE STATUS



Total Sites: 196
\*LTM is a subset of Response Complete



18

#### FOCUS ON THE FIELD



**FUDS** 

# Rapid Response Protects Human Health and Historic Places

DoD is addressing cleanup of military munitions according to the health and safety risks posed by the munitions. In cases where the potential risks are too great to wait for completion of the full response process, DoD must act quickly to reduce the immediate risks posed at a site. To achieve this rapid response, DoD conducts interim actions or time-critical removal actions. Quick, thorough actions minimize the chances for additional danger.

In 1942, loud booms echoed through the East Fork at Camp Hale, Colorado, as the Army's 10<sup>th</sup> Mountain Division honed winter warfare skills that would help win decisive victories in the mountains of Italy during World War II.

In 2003, the bang of explosions ricocheted through the mountains once again: this time from the destruction of World War II-era munitions that did not detonate during training years ago.



MMRP surface sweep and removal efforts at Camp Hale.


The presence of unexploded ordnance became a concern in the summer of 2000 following a hiker's discovery of a live mortar shell. Site investigations revealed potentially explosive munitions, including rifle grenades, mortar rounds, recoilless rifle projectiles, and anti-tank land mines. This prompted the U.S. Forest Service to close 1,400 acres of the East Fork Valley in September 2000, including the Camp Hale National Historic Site. The discovery of these weapons sparked an immediate need to remove any materials that could potentially threaten public health and safety.

The Omaha District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), working with the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and the U.S. Forest Service, decided to undertake a time-critical removal action involving a surface sweep of the valley floor.

Surface sweep and removal staff received extensive training including ordnance recognition, sweep procedures, magnetometer training, and local environmental hazards awareness. Training also included the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's 40-hour hazardous waste operations course, and practice sweeps in clean, seeded grids to ensure preparedness.


Work at the site ended on time, as scheduled, in early August 2003. "When the valley is reopened to the public, it will be a much safer place," said Jerry Hodgson, Camp Hale project manager. "We did a good thing this summer. We spent taxpayer's money in a responsible and prudent manner. We did the work safely and in cooperation and partnership with the state and the U.S. Forest Service. We also used local resources and aided the local economy."


installations and FUDS properties. Many MMRP sites reach the RC milestone directly from investigation, when it is determined that the site does not pose a safety or environmental risk that requires a remedial action. Figures 17 and 18 illustrate the cumulative number of BRAC sites and FUDS sites, respectively, achieving RC from both investigation and cleanup over the last four fiscal years.



<sup>\*</sup>FY2000 through FY2002 totals have been updated since the previous Annual Report to reflect new and revised data as of FY2003.

Alternatively, some sites are found to require an immediate response, where the risk requires mitigation in an accelerated timeframe. At these sites, DoD may conduct an interim action to address any immediate risks to human health and the environment. Figures 19 and 20 show the number of interim actions completed at MMRP sites on BRAC installations and FUDS properties. As of the end of FY2003, DoD conducted one interim action at an active installation MMRP site. This interim action was performed at Naval Magazine Lualualei.





<sup>\*</sup>FY2000 through FY2002 totals have been updated since the previous Annual Report to reflect new and revised data as of FY2003.



**DERP Funding** 

Conducting and managing environmental restoration activities at over 30,000 sites requires accurate planning, funding, and execution. DoD carefully coordinates, prioritizes, and tracks environmental restoration activities to use funding efficiently. Due to the cost and complexity of restoration work, DoD must plan its activities years in advance to ensure that adequate funding is available for the DERP to progress smoothly toward completion of environmental restoration requirements. DoD's ability to plan for and conduct cleanup activities depends on stable and predictable funding.

## The DERP Budget Process

DoD develops the budget for the DERP based on the anticipated funds needed to meet environmental restoration requirements. The DERP's budget process is designed to ensure that adequate funding is received and efficiently executed in the program. To achieve this, DoD's budget process is closely tied to program planning and execution, with budget development beginning with site-level funding requirements and building through the Component-level submissions to determine total program funding needs. Many factors influence cleanup funding levels, including prioritization of sites, progress toward program goals, and identification of new sites.

DoD builds the DERP budget based on site-level data and funding requirements. Using this site-level information, each installation or property in the DERP develops and maintains a management action plan, or a BRAC cleanup plan for BRAC installations, to manage environmental restoration activities under both the IRP and MMRP. These tools are used to estimate anticipated funding needs and to allocate funding received. Management action plans and BRAC cleanup plans contain information about an installation's past environmental restoration activities and current status, present a vision for future site-level requirements, establish cleanup schedules, and identify anticipated funding requirements through completion. Each installation updates its management action plan at least once a year, and updates BRAC cleanup plans as needed, to reflect changes in priorities, additional cleanup information, new policies, cleanup progress, and funding.

Once Congress approves the budget, environmental restoration funding for active installations and FUDS properties is appropriated into five Component-specific Environmental Restoration (ER) accounts. The Army, Navy, and Air Force manage individual ER accounts for environmental response activities at their active installations. A fourth account funds the FUDS program. The Army serves as the executive agent for the FUDS program, which the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers executes. The fifth account, the Defense-wide account, supports OSD's oversight of the DERP and cleanup initiatives for DLA and DTRA. Environmental restoration activities at BRAC installations are funded through a seperate account structure, which addresses closure-related environmental compliance and environmental planning activities, in addition to environmental restoration.

The DERP's budget process takes approximately two years to complete, so that the DERP budget appropriated for FY2003 began development at the installation level in FY2001. This process requires DoD to carefully plan both its environmental restoration activities and assess its funding needs years in advance.



## **Funding Trends**

In the past 19 years, DoD has invested around \$25 billion in environmental restoration. For FY2003 alone, Congress appropriated approximately \$1.3 billion for environmental restoration activities at active installations and FUDS properties. Congress appropriated an additional \$760 million for environmental activities at BRAC installations, including compliance and planning, as well as cleanup.

Congress has provided stable funding for the DERP since FY1995, as evidenced by DoD's funding profile illustrated in Figure 21. The Department depends on congressional support to provide this stable and predictable funding, needed to effectively plan and conduct environmental restoration activities and achieve program goals.




FIGURE 21: ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND BRAC ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDING TRENDS

\*Includes DLA prior year unobligated balance available for execution in FY05.

## **Environmental Restoration Funding**


Actual and requested FY2002–FY2005 DoD funding by Component for environmental restoration activities at active installations and FUDS properties is shown in Figure 22. In FY2003, Army obligated \$394.4 million (\$393.7 million in appropriations and \$0.7 million in recoveries); Navy obligated \$255.4 million; Air Force obligated \$387.8 million (\$387.6 million in appropriations and \$0.2 million in recoveries); FUDS obligated \$246.9 million, and Defense-wide activities obligated \$23.4 million. ER funding has remained stable both for the DERP as a whole and also for the five individual accounts, as the figure illustrates.


### ER Funding Trends in the IRP

As IRP sites progress through the cleanup process, more sites complete investigations and advance to cleanup activities. As a result, DoD spends increasingly more funding on cleanup activities and less on investigation. This trend is reflected in Figure 23, which shows the actual



FIGURE 22: ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUNDING PROFILE FOR ACTIVE INSTALLATIONS AND FUDS PROPERTIES\*






<sup>\*</sup>Funding shown includes all IRP, MMRP, and management and support costs. Due to rounding, Component subtotal may not equal fiscal year totals.

and planned funding for IRP cleanup, investigation, and program support at active installations and FUDS from FY1993 though FY2005. During FY2003, DoD spent approximately 59 percent of funding on cleanup and used 26 percent to complete investigation phases. Figure 23 also demonstrates that the DERP maintains a consistently low level of program management and support costs.

FIGURE 23: ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OBLIGATIONS AND PLANNING ESTIMATES FOR CLEANUP, INVESTIGATION, AND PROGRAM SUPPORT AT ACTIVE INSTALLATIONS AND FUDS





Progress can also be measured using program cost-to-complete (CTC) estimates, which are an estimation of anticipated costs necessary to complete environmental restoration requirements. CTC estimates, derived from the budgeting process, are based on site-level data and provide the most accurate picture of anticipated cost trends for addressing environmental restoration requirements. As such, CTC estimates are an important oversight and program management tool used to assess future funding needs and determine if funding is being used effectively.

DoD forecasts that the shift in sites from investigation phases to cleanup phases will continue to increase, causing an increasingly larger portion of the total IRP CTC estimate to be devoted to cleanup phases. This trend toward decreased investigation funding requirements and corresponding increases in cleanup funding requirements is demonstrated in Figures 24 and 25.

FIGURE 24: ACTIVE INSTALLATION AND FUDS PROPERTY IRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY PHASE CATEGORY, FY2004-COMPLETE\*

(In \$000)

							FY10-
Phase	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Complete
Investigation	ıs 252,268	172,145	105,141	89,920	145,704	102,804	350,460
IRA	158,924	117,142	145,406	100,774	81,649	65,887	402,864
RD	42,095	38,408	29,321	13,537	19,247	17,747	51,666
RA-C	385,935	449,724	508,520	549,997	412,881	500,127	1,837,944
RA-O	159,579	179,619	197,653	229,820	318,197	303,122	3,038,441
LTM	48,829	56,718	69,376	82,027	92,483	93,603	1,580,113
Total	1.047,630	1,013,756	1,055,417	1,066,075	1,070,161	1,083,290	7,261,488

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, DTRA, other miscellaneous costs, and MMRP funding.

FIGURE 25: ACTIVE INSTALLATION AND FUDS PROPERTY IRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY PHASE CATEGORY AND COMPONENT, FY2004-COMPLETE\*

(In \$000)

Phase	Army	Navy	Air Force	DLA	FUDS	Total
Investigation	284,700	347,990	199,803	7,150	378,799	1,218,442
IRA	76,503	517,211	446,935	0	31,997	1,072,646
RD	58,100	36,077	52,344	1,355	64,145	212,021
RA-C	1,352,552	747,366	704,285	30,124	1,810,801	4,645,128
RA-O	785,122	845,439	1,968,845	59,323	767,702	4,426,431
LTM	527,041	238,764	684,653	5,648	567,043	2,023,149
Total	3,084,018	2,732,847	4,056,865	103,600	3,620,487	13,597,817

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, DTRA, other miscellaneous costs, and MMRP funding.

The Department spent the greatest portion of funding in FY2003 on remaining high relative-risk sites, continuing its commitment to addressing all of these sites by FY2007. The amount of funding required for high relative-risk sites, though, as shown in Figure 26, will decrease as DoD nears its goal. Greater funding amounts will then be used to address medium relative-risk sites, commensurate with meeting DoD's FY2011 goal for these sites. Further evidence that the Department is focusing on addressing sites that pose the greatest risk is evidenced by the overall funding amounts forecasted by the Components for each relative-risk site type: the majority of funding, as shown in Figure 27, is planned for addressing high relative-risk sites.



FIGURE 26: ACTIVE INSTALLATION AND FUDS PROPERTY IRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES
BY RELATIVE RISK, FY2004-COMPLETE\*

(In \$000)

							FY10-
Relative-Risk	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Complete
High	563,840	593,400	563,607	521,763	353,500	354,604	2,670,769
Medium	166,691	138,633	207,324	245,305	372,276	397,274	1,113,347
Low	65,761	75,963	65,642	93,225	139,695	162,505	954,557
Not Evaluated	57,876	35,871	54,564	56,461	50,458	38,283	994,584
Not Required	193,462	169,889	164,280	149,321	154,232	130,624	1,528,231
Total	1.047,630	1,013,756	1,055,417	1,066,075	1,070,161	1,083,290	7,261,488

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, DTRA, other miscellaneous costs, and MMRP funding.

## FIGURE 27: ACTIVE INSTALLATION AND FUDS PROPERTY IRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY RELATIVE RISK AND COMPONENT, FY2004-COMPLETE\*

(In \$000)

Relative-Risk	Army	Navy	Air Force	DLA	FUDS	Total
High	1,291,898	1,597,617	1,517,783	10,050	1,204,135	5,621,483
Medium	893,738	405,143	837,898	18,737	485,334	2,640,850
Low	378,258	286,908	544,846	14,423	332,913	1,557,348
Not Evaluated	50,852	19,791	305,645	264	911,545	1,288,097
Not Required	469,272	423,388	850,693	60,126	686,560	2,490,039
Total	3.084.018	2,732,847	4,056,865	103,600	3,620,487	13,597,817

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, DTRA, other miscellaneous costs, and MMRP funding

### ER Funding Trends in the MMRP

As in the IRP, CTC estimates show anticipated cost trends for addressing MMRP requirements. As the MMRP matures and sites are further characterized, DoD's CTC estimates will continue to improve and provide a more refined picture of munitions response requirements.

Similar to the early years of the IRP, a large percentage of MMRP funding at the beginning of the program is planned for investigation activities. As the MMRP matures, DoD expects to spend the majority of MMRP funding on implementing cleanup remedies at MMRP sites. Funding requirements anticipated for MMRP activities, as shown in Figure 28, demonstrate that the Department believes the majority of these sites will require cleanup activities, such as discrete removal actions, which occur in the remedial action construction phase.

# FIGURE 28: ACTIVE INSTALLATION AND FUDS PROPERTY MMRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY PHASE CATEGORY, FY2004-COMPLETE\*†

(In \$000)

Phase	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Complete
Investigation	43,436	55,527	50,963	42,509	42,771	50,800	2,249,444
IRA	1,417	58	0	0	0	0	35,085
RD	112	1,754	1,976	2,878	1,200	469	133,125
RA-C	37,929	49,593	46,509	59,752	78,540	72,861	11,871,371
RA-O	0	0	0	0	0	0	281,496
LTM	740	2,405	72	356	488	386	1,081,777
Total	83,634	109,337	99,520	105,495	122,999	124,516	15,652,298

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, DTRA, other miscellaneous costs, and IRP funding.

t"Active installations" refers solely to areas other than operational ranges.

The FUDS program has the highest CTC estimates for MMRP activities due to the large number of MMRP sites present at FUDS properties. All Components with MMRP sites, however, will be spending an increasing amount of funding on MMRP activities in future years, as shown in Figure 29, as DoD continues to increase its focus on addressing the risks associated with these sites.

FIGURE 29: ACTIVE INSTALLATION AND FUDS PROPERTY MMRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY PHASE CATEGORY AND COMPONENT, FY2004-COMPLETE\*†

(In \$000)


Phase	Army	Navy	Air Force	DLA	FUDS	Total
Investigation	555,392	93,880	140,027	0	1,746,151	2,535,450
IRA	0	28,189	6,896	0	1,475	36,560
RD	57,969	6,198	24,522	0	52,825	141,514
RA-C	2,303,794	213,507	389,152	0	9,310,102	12,216,555
RA-O	64,702	1,788	215,006	0	0	281,496
LTM	107,881	41,931	62,459	0	873,953	1,086,224
Total	3,089,738	385,493	838,062	0	11,984,506	16,297,799

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, DTRA, other miscellaneous costs, and IRP funding.

## **BRAC Funding**

Funding for environmental activities, including compliance and planning, at BRAC installations has steadily declined from FY2002 through FY2005, as shown in Figure 30, demonstrating that DoD is completing environmental restoration requirements at these installations and less funding is needed in future years. FY2003 BRAC environmental funding includes \$162.8 million for Army, \$462.2 million for Navy, \$125.4 million for Air Force, and \$10.2 million for DLA. FY2004 and FY2005 funding requirements will continue this trend of decreasing funding required, as additional cleanup actions are completed and BRAC installations reach the RIP/RC milestone.

FIGURE 30: BRAC ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDING PROFILE FOR BRAC INSTALLATIONS\*
(In millions of dollars)



<sup>\*</sup>Funding shown includes all IRP, MMRP, compliance, planning, and management and support costs. Due to rounding, Component subtotals may not equal fiscal year totals.

<sup>†&</sup>quot;Active installations" refers solely to areas other than operational ranges.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Includes DLA prior year unobligated balance available for execution in FY05.



At Navy installations, BRAC funding requirements are further decreased due to the incorporation of Navy's land sale revenues generated through property transfer. As Navy transfers its excess property the revenue created is being used to fund cleanup requirements at other Navy BRAC installations, offsetting the amount needed from Congress.

### **BRAC Funding Trends in the IRP**

Similar to the progression of IRP sites at active installations and FUDS, BRAC IRP sites are also demonstrating progress through phases, moving from investigation to cleanup. Over the past 10 years, DoD has devoted increasingly more BRAC resources for funding cleanup activities, while less funding was needed for investigation activities. This trend extends through the end of the environmental restoration program as shown in Figures 31 and 32, which display DoD's IRP CTC estimates for BRAC installations. These data demonstrate program progress by showing that funding estimates for early phases in the restoration process are expected to continue to decrease, while funding for later phases will increase.

FIGURE 31: BRAC INSTALLATION IRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY PHASE CATEGORY,
FY2004-COMPLETE\*
(in \$000)

Phase	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY0B	FY09	FY10- Complete
Investigation	21,742	12,185	7,030	1,238	1,000	659	865
IRA	24,053	6,191	44,204	0	0	0	0
RD	3,237	7,193	2,951	3,350	528	3,851	2,138
RA-C	99,262	83,045	115,662	37,780	63,655	40,776	403,806
RA-O	79,340	100,134	126,403	62,536	61,762	49,832	929,151
LTM	20,885	16,918	42,105	11,423	12,179	11,371	259,776
Total	248,519	225,666	338,355	116,327	139,124	106,489	1,595,736

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, other miscellaneous costs, and MMRP funding.

FIGURE 32: BRAC INSTALLATION IRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY PHASE CATEGORY AND COMPONENT, FY2004-COMPLETE\*

(in \$000)

Phase	Army	Navy	Air Force	DLA	Total
Investigation	8,998	9,479	26,242	0	44,719
IRA	26	58,063	16,359	0	74,448
RD	11,354	5,246	6,398	250	23,248
RA-C	212,467	88,075	529,879	13,565	843,986
RA-O	126,023	271.659	998,441	13,035	1,409,158
LTM	80,259	96,636	194,315	3,447	374,657
Total	439.127	529.158	1.771.634	30,297	2,770,216

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, other miscellaneous costs, and MMRP funding.

## **BRAC Funding Trends in the MMRP**

DoD conducted munitions response actions and addressed explosive safety hazards under the IRP incidental to hazardous waste remediation, particularly at BRAC sites, prior to the development of the MMRP in FY2001. This experience is reflected in the MMRP site progress at BRAC installations, where a significant number of MMRP sites have already advanced to the cleanup stages of the environmental restoration process. This experience is also shown in DoD's estimated funding requirements for MMRP activities at BRAC sites, provided in Figure 33 by budget year and phase. The bulk of BRAC funding has been allocated for remedial action construction in both the current year and future years, indicating that a large portion of BRAC MMRP sites have already moved into cleanup stages.

26 FISCAL YEAR 2003 •



#### FOCUS ON THE FIELD



DLA

# Remedial Process Optimization Leads to Efficient Cleanup in the Arctic

One tool that DoD uses to evaluate and improve site remediation processes so that maximum risk reduction is achieved for each dollar spent is remedial process optimization (RPO). RPO is a systematic, iterative process that evaluates remedial processes for overall system effectiveness to enhance remedy effectiveness and reduce overall site cleanup costs, taking alternative remedial approaches and new technologies into consideration.

For more than 50 years, a privately owned salvage yard 6 miles southeast of Fairbanks, Alaska, has been home to a variety of scrapped and damaged materials: assorted old cars, military vehicles, batteries, and transformers—all at one point thought to contain salvageable metals. Efforts to recover the metals, as well as the unprotected dumping of asbestos and thousands of drums of liquid wastes, led to the inevitable: the contamination of this site with significant levels of lead and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), posing a huge risk to human health and the surrounding environment.



Stakeholders tour the Arctic Surplus Salvage Yard.

Years of interagency disagreement and budget obstacles prevented a viable remedy from being implemented at this site, now known as the Arctic Surplus Salvage Yard, but that all changed in 2002 when DoD tasked the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) as lead agency for cleaning up the yard.

DLA assembled an RPO team of remediation experts from DLA, Air Force, EPA, and the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation to visit the site and review EPA's 1995 Record of Decision (ROD) for cleaning up Arctic Surplus. The RPO team recommended several modifications to the remedial actions specified in the original ROD, such as re-sampling the soils at the site to better identify PCB hotspots, which refined the estimate of highly contaminated soil from 5,200 cubic yards stated in the original ROD, to 70 cubic yards. The RPO team also recognized that PCB solvent extraction was not necessary and instead recommended solidifying and stabilizing all PCB- and lead-contaminated soil and placing the mixture as a cover over the old landfill found at the site. In addition, the RPO team invited local fire departments to conduct fire-training exercises at the site to help neutralize pressurized tanks, which reduced the original cost estimate for neutralizing the tanks by 90 percent and resulted in enhanced relationships with the local community.

By implementing the RPO team's recommendations, DLA reduced the cost of remedial action at the site from \$38 million to \$3.5 million, a ten-fold decrease. The remediation time also decreased, from an anticipated four years to just one year. In addition, the original remediation proposal rendered the property unusable, while the RPO proposal to change the landfill contaminant cap to a flat design allows for unlimited industrial use on almost all of the land.

This site will serve as an RPO case study for use in training other states, federal agencies, and stakeholders in the benefits of conducting a successful optimization process. The completed remedial actions will now allow the EPA to delist the site from the National Priorities List next year.



DoD's estimated CTC for munitions responses at BRAC installations is composed primarily of funding for addressing MMRP requirements at Army BRAC installations, as shown in Figure 34. The majority of funding across each Component having identified MMRP requirements, however, centers on cleanup activities, rather than on investigation, further demonstrating the progress already made at BRAC installations to address MMRP requirements.

FIGURE 33: BRAC INSTALLATION MMRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY PHASE CATEGORY, FY2004-COMPLETE\*

(In S000)

							FY10-
Phase	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Complete
Investigation	604	14,704	0 -	25	25	290	398
IRA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RD	59	281	145	0	0	605	573
RA-C	12,001	16,712	40.540	2,145	2,566	25,708	381,376
RA-O	0	50	100	0	1,778	0	526
LTM	621	1,175	1,466	1,358	1,446	1,308	39,296
Total	13,285	32,922	42,251	3,528	5,815	27,911	422,169

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, DTRA, other miscellaneous costs, and IRP funding

FIGURE 34: BRAC INSTALLATION MMRP COST-TO-COMPLETE ESTIMATES BY PHASE CATEGORY AND COMPONENT, FY2004-COMPLETE\*

(In \$000	

Phase	Army	Navy	Air Force	DLA	Total
Investigation	14,041	2,005	0	0	16,046
IRA	0	0	0	0	0
RD	1,531	132	0	0	1,663
RA-C	432,261	48,787	0	0	481,048
RA-O	1,924	530	0	0	2,454
LTM	46,318	352	0	0	46,670
Total	496.075	51.806	0	0	547,881

<sup>\*</sup>Does not include program management, DTRA, other miscellaneous costs, and IRP funding.

## Partnerships with Stakeholders

The Department continues to improve stakeholder involvement in the environmental restoration process to ensure that the concerns of the public and regulators are being addressed. DoD relies on partnerships with communities, tribal governments, and state and federal agencies to facilitate the DERP's implementation by providing the insight necessary to effectively execute restoration requirements and expedite the cleanup process. The remainder of this chapter discusses these relationships and the mechanisms used to facilitate community and stakeholder involvement.

## Community Partnering

28

Engaging the community is an effective way to identify and address environmental restoration concerns. DoD involves the community in the DERP through public outreach and efforts to promote public participation. Informally, through outreach, the Department works to give stakeholders a better understanding of the DERP. DoD also uses formal mechanisms to promote community understanding of and participation in the environmental restoration process, including Restoration Advisory Boards (RABs) and technical assistance for public participation (TAPP) contracts.



#### Restoration Advisory Boards

RABs are groups comprising local community members and representatives of the installation, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and state, Tribal, and local governments that provide advice to an installation or FUDS property regarding environmental restoration activities. RAB members share community views with installation decision-makers and report information back to the community on DoD's environmental restoration activities. In addition, RABs increase community understanding and support for the DERP by providing a venue for DoD to discuss and share information regarding cleanup activities, enabling early and continuous flow of environmental restoration information among the affected community, DoD, and regulatory agencies.

The RAB program is now one of the largest public involvement efforts through a federal agency. DoD ensures that the installation representatives and the other RAB members have access to the tools and resources necessary to make the program effective. In FY2003, DoD had 298


active RABs across all of the Military Components, and invested approximately \$3.3 million in the administrative cost of RAB operations. Figures 35 and 36, respectively, show the number of RABs and their expenditures by Component in FY2003.

For more information on the RAB program, visit


http://www.dtic.mil/envirodod/ Stakeholder/WCommunity/



#### FIGURE 35: NUMBER OF RABS PER COMPONENT IN FY2003



#### FIGURE 36: FY2003 RAB EXPENDITURES BY COMPONENT



## Technical Assistance for Public Participation

Another way DoD facilitates meaningful community involvement in the DERP is though TAPP contracts. Through a TAPP contract, DoD procures the services of an independent technical consultant with appropriate expertise to advise the local RAB or technical review committee (TRC) on a specific project, and provide them with an explanation of technical issues independent of DoD. Environmental restoration issues can be complex, and this complexity may be a barrier to a community's understanding and acceptance of an installation's environmental restoration efforts. TAPP contracts assist communities in understanding and evaluating technical issues. With this increased understanding comes increased community trust, confidence, and meaningful involvement in environmental restoration activities. TAPP awards for FY2003 are listed in Figure 37.







NAVY

# Strong Partnership Ensures Efficient Cleanup for Naval Shipyard

DoD relies on partnerships with federal and state agencies and communities to advance restoration efforts. Collaboration with stakeholders provides DoD with a mechanism to most effectively and cost-efficiently clean up property.

Significant contamination at two Portsmouth, Virginia, NPL sites will no longer threaten the Elizabeth River thanks to a collaborative agreement forged by the Navy, state and federal regulators, and a local industry.

The landmark agreement represented a major breakthrough in discussions about cleaning up the two comingled properties, which belong to the Norfolk Nawy Shipyard and Atlantic Wood Industries.



Treating contaminated water in waste lagoons at Norfolk Naval Shipyard.

Through the resolution, the Navy and Atlantic Wood agreed to approach the cleanup as a single project. They also settled several legal and financial issues with federal and state agencies.

"The relationship forged between [this agreement's] partners will be a foundation for success in future projects not yet started," said Mike Host of the Norfolk Naval Shipyard Environmental Division. "It will demonstrate in a very real way what people and organizations, working together, can accomplish."

The Navy and Atlantic Wood worked with the Department of Justice, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Virginia Department

of Environmental Quality to plan the cleanup. Locally, community participants included the Restoration Advisory Board, Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences, and Elizabeth River Project.

The cleanup plan included the excavation of waste lagoons to create a 1.5-acre wetland. To acheive this, cleanup measures involved removing abrasive blast material and petroleum-contaminated soil, capping a disposal area, and draining and treating contaminated water from the waste lagoons. Contaminants at the sites came from past industrial operations at the property, and include calcium hydroxide, abrasive blast material, metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, treated wood wastes, and inert construction debris. During the cleanup, an engineering firm excavated 42,000 tons of soil and treated more than 4 million gallons of contaminated water. In addition to the creation of the wetland, shrubs and bushes were planted to create a riparian buffer.

"This is a major, major breakthrough in the restoration of the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River," said Majorie Mayfield-Jackson, executive director of the Elizabeth River Project. "Congratulations to all for persevering to overcome complex and daunting obstacles. Future generations will appreciate it."



FIGURE 37: RABS AND TRCS UTILIZING TAPP CONTRACTS IN FY2003

Component	RAB/TRC	TAPP Award
Army	Army Research, Development, and Engineering Command (Picatinny Arsenal)	\$23,000
	Fort McClellan	\$2,000
	Jefferson Proving Ground	\$25,000
	Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant	\$15,000
Nayy	Treasure Island, Hunters Point Annex	\$16,000
	Calverton NWIRP	\$24,600
	Vieques	\$24,960
Air Force	Four Lakes Community Air Guard Station	\$600
	Spokane International Airport	\$600
	North Smithfield ANGS	\$82,900
DLA	DLA received no TAPP awards	
FUDS	Marion Engineer Depot	\$12,000
	Scioto Ordnance Plant	\$12,000

## **State Partnerships**

Environmental restoration is most cost-effective and expeditious with state support of DoD's cleanup decisions. DoD's partnerships with states streamline the environmental restoration process and improve decision making. By maintaining open communication with states, DoD is better able to understand state-specific issues and ensure consistency of environmental restoration decisions within a state. Partnerships established with individual states through venues such as the Defense and State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) program provide an opportunity for DoD to address the specific concerns and objectives of each state. Most recently, DoD has been engaged with state, tribal, and other federal agency representatives in the Munitions Response Committee to address concerns with DoD's MMRP. In addition, DoD partners with many state-led organizations, including the Interstate Technology Regulatory Council, the Environmental Council of States, and the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, to advance the environmental restoration program in a wide range of subject areas.

## Defense and State Memoranda of Agreement

Through the DSMOA program, DoD reimburses states for the services they provide in support of DERP activities. When DoD and a state sign a DSMOA, the two establish an ongoing partnership. Both parties then enter into a Cooperative Agreement (CA), which provides the planning and funding framework for the environmental restoration support activities the state will conduct at DoD facilities over the next two years.

DoD signed 51 DSMOAs with 46 states, 4 territories, and the District of Columbia by the end of FY2003. Of the states and territories eligible for DSMOA funding, 45 states and 2 territories have submitted applications for CAs to receive funding. Oklahoma, American Samoa, and Puerto Rico did not file CAs. A list of the states and territories eligible to participate in the DSMOA program, including their status as of September 30, 2003, and point of contact information, is available




## FY2003 DERP Annual Report to Congress Web site:

http://63.88.245.60/DERPARC\_FY03

though the Web site for the FY2003 DERP Annual Report to Congress. During FY2003, DoD reimbursed states with \$27.1 million for their assistance through the DSMOA program. The distribution of FY2003 DSMOA funding by state is provided in Figure 38.

#### FIGURE 38: DSMOA REIMBURSEMENTS IN FY2003



### Interstate Technology Regulatory Council

The Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (ITRC), is a state-led coalition that works with industries and stakeholders to achieve regulatory acceptance of environmental technologies. Through this organization, DoD partners with other ITRC members, including states, other federal agencies, private industry experts, and other stakeholders to facilitate the use of new technologies by reducing technical and regulatory barriers, improving regulatory permitting processes, and speeding the implementation of new environmental technologies. DoD's partnership with ITRC has enhanced cooperation among state regulators, DoD personnel, and community stakeholders and increased the deployment of innovative technology at DERP sites. For examples of this partnership, visit ITRC's Web site.





#### **FOCUS ON THE FIELD**



**FUDS** 

# New Web Site Offers Information on Formerly Used Defense Sites

DoD recognizes the need for easily accessible and available information related to cleanup, and continued to enhance the program's methods of community outreach in FY2003. The Internet provides DoD with a wide range of opportunities to communicate with its own personnel and stakeholders. The use of Web sites devoted to DERP projects makes current information about program-wide issues, as well as information on activities at local installations and communities, readily available to the public.

A new Web site is making it easier for people to find the information they need about Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is cleaning up.

The site's chief highlight—a public geographic information system (GIS)—features an easily navigated map of 1,500 FUDS properties across the nation. Users simply zoom in on the property they would like to learn about, click on it, and a detailed information page appears. This page provides a synopsis of the property's location, a brief description and history of restoration-related activities, and estimated cleanup costs. Users can also find out if the property has a Restoration Advisory Board, and can obtain the phone numbers of USACE district office contacts.

USACE plans to update the GIS property information annually based on data in the DERP Annual Report to Congress.

"It is important to us that the public knows and understands what we are doing at these properties, and can provide their thoughts on how best to clean up these properties," said Robert Lubbert, Chief, USACE FUDS Branch.

Other Web site features include success stories, an informational brochure, the FUDS inventory, and a copy of the FUDS Program Manual for environmental restoration. Site designers also built in a feedback loop for users to send their questions and suggestions on how to make the Web site more useful.

"This is the culmination of a great deal of work to get this information out to the public in a readily accessible way, taking advantage of the technology available to us today," Lubbert said.

To access the new FUDS Web site, go to:

http://m1.crrel.usace.army.mil/fuds/





#### ECOS and ASTSWMO

DoD also partners with state organizations that address environmental regulatory and policy issues, such as Environmental Council of States (ECOS), and Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials (ASTSWMO). ECOS is a nonprofit, nonpartisan national association of state and territorial environmental commissioners that works to enhance the exchange of ideas and foster cooperation in environmental management among states and with federal agencies. ASTSWMO, an organization supporting the environmental agencies of the states and territories, works to enhance and promote effective state and territorial waste management programs and national waste management policies. In the past two years, DoD has worked with state representatives of these organizations and with other federal agencies to establish the Munitions Response Committee to address concerns related to DoD's implemenation of its MMRP. Through partnerships with these organizations, DoD is able to work



For more information on ECOS and ASTSWMO, visit:

http://www.sso.org/ecos/ or http://www.astswmo.org

collaboratively with states to address emerging environmental issues and solicit state input on DERP policies and guidance. This collaboration garners state support for the DERP and expedites the restoration process by promoting better communication and planning with states.

## Federal Agency Partnerships

DoD has established many working relationships with other federal agencies that continue to be crucial to the success of the DERP. These partnerships support efficient cleanup by expediting reviews of technical documents and helping DoD apply sound approaches to site remediation. In addition, the partnerships DoD has formed with federal agencies have assisted DoD in mitigating interagency conflicts potentially harmful to the DERP's progress. Two agencies that DoD partners with most prominently are the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) and EPA.

### Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

ATSDR, an agency of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, often assists DoD in resolving community health concerns about the release of hazardous substances resulting from past DoD activities. Under CERCLA, ATSDR has the authority to provide a variety of health services, including public health assessments (PHAs), to protect human health at DoD and non-DoD sites that are on or proposed for the NPL or are the subject of citizen petition.

The PHA evaluates hazardous substance releases, community health concerns, and local health outcome data. ATSDR performs these assessments through a variety of methods, including consultations and health studies that involve public comment periods and community assistance panels; health education to the community; and education for DoD and private health care providers. DoD provides funding to ATSDR through a memorandum of understanding. To date, ATSDR completed 151 PHAs for DoD installations and properties as a result of this partnership. Three PHAs are currently undergoing public comment, and 4 are undergoing initial review. ATSDR published 12 initial release documents, 14 public comment releases, and 12 final release documents in FY2003. ATSDR's public health activities at DoD NPL sites provide valuable information to both DoD and the local community regarding human health risks at installations.



#### Environmental Protection Agency

EPA is the Department's most frequent federal partner throughout the restoration process. As the agency responsible for ensuring compliance with federal environmental laws and regulations, EPA is an active participant in the environmental restoration decision-making process at many DoD installations. Like DoD, EPA has been engaged with the states, tribes, and other federal agencies for the Munitions Response Committee. One of the most common partnership tools for involving EPA in the restoration process is an interagency agreement (IAG) or Federal facility agreement (FFA). Federal facilities are required to enter into an IAG or an FFA within 180 days of completion of the remedial investigation/feasibility study at an NPL installation. These agreements outline the roles and responsibilities of the Military Component(s), EPA, and, frequently, the state in the cleanup process.

DoD had 12 IAGs under negotiation in FY2003, and has signed 118 IAGs as of September 30, 2003. Figure 39 lists all installations that conducted negotiations toward or signed IAGs or FFAs

FIGURE 39: INSTALLATIONS THAT CONDUCTED NEGOTIATIONS TOWARD OR SIGNED IAGS AND FFAS IN FY2003

Samponeni	Installation Name	AGEA Shiiis	Description of Cases in Which Negotiations Are Under Way or No Agreement Was Reached Within 180 Days of Completion of the RI/FS
Army	Fort Eustis	Negotiations ongoing	Draft FFA undergoing legal review. RUFS underway.
	Fort Meade	Negotiations ongoing	Disagreements continue with HQ EPA over enforcement language and with EPA Rgn III over NPL boundary delineation. Draft FFA reviewed. RI/FS field work completed.
Navy	Cherry Point Marine Corps Base	Negotiations ongoing	Re-negotiations between Navy and regulator to begin November 2004 nowthat EPA and DoD principles for land use controls and Post ROD actions are final.
	Mechanicsburg Naval Inventory Control Point	Negotiations ongoing	Consensus on most of the language in the agreement has been completed. Previous issues with post-ROD and LUC authority have recently been resolved. Expect signed agreement in FY2004.
	Parris Island Marine Corps Recruit Depot	Negotiations ongoing	Negotiations in progress between DoD and EPA. Expect signed agreement in early FY2004.
	Puget Sound Naval Shipyard (Jackson Park Housing Complex)	Negotiations ongoing	Negotiations on hold until issue regarding primary documents and post ROD authority is resolved between EPA and DoD.
	Whiting Field Naval Air Station	Negotiations ongoing	Signing delayed. Discussions continuing but execution is delayed pending resolution of DoD and HO EPA issues related to post ROD authority and LUCs. Should resume negotiation in FY2004.
Air Force	Air Force Plant 44	Negotiations ongoing	In FY2003, FFA not signed because of disagreement between AF and EPA. The agencies could not agree on what documents should be primary and what documents should be secondary.
	Hansoom Air Force Base	Negotiations orgoing	Negotiations at the local level has been completed but two outstanding issues remain which have been elevated to EPA Headquarters/Secretary of the Air Force for resolution. The issues concern the "Reservation of Rights" language and whether or not the Remedial Action Completed Report is to be a primary document.
	Hill Air Force Base	Negotiations ongoing	Negotiations for an innovative IAG for the Utah Testing and Training Range (UTTR) took place in FY2002 and FY2003 but regulatory issues delayed its completion.
	Langley Air Force Base	Negotiations ongoing	EPA Region III invoked dispute resolution because of a disagreement over the institutional control language used in Langley's recent ROD. DoD and HQ EPA became the dispute resolution authorities. ACC is proceeding with the deanup/construction at the sites where EPA agrees with our proposed physical remedies. Five additional RODs are delayed at Langley until the outcome of this dispute.
	McGuire Air Force Base	Negotiations ongoing	Draft FFA under review. The RI/FS is not complete.






in FY2003, and provides additional information regarding the status of these agreements. Cost estimates and budgetary proposals for IAGs can be found in Table B-1. This table provides information on environmental restoration costs associated with the IAG or FFA that each DoD installation has incurred through FY2003 and estimates of each installation's costs for the partnership from FY2004 through completion. The public did not submit any comments on IAGs to DoD during FY2003.



The purpose of this report is to fulfill the Department's statutory reporting requirements to Congress. This report presents information on environmental restoration activities funded through the Component ER accounts or, for BRAC installations, through the Component Military Construction Appropriations. This chapter provided a general overview of the DERP, highlighting DoD's success in advancing the program. It also outlined DoD's past, current, and estimated future funding requirements to ensure continued program success and summarized DoD's progress in both the IRP and MMRP categories of the DERP. The status and progress of each Component's environmental restoration program is described in the subsequent chapter. Further detail on funding and site progress, down to the installation level, is provided in the appendices.

- FISCAL YEAR 2003 -



# COMPONENT RESTORATION STATUS AND PROGRESS

Although the Office of the Secreatry of Defense (OSD) provides oversight of and guidance for the overall Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP), the Military Components are responsible for managing funding and execution of environmental response activities to meet the OSD established program goals. Since the Components and their individual defense missions vary greatly, managing the program at the Component level with DoD oversight affords consistency of program guidance and overall goals while providing each Component the ability to address its environmental restoration requirements according to Component-specific needs and requirements.

The Component Restoration Status and Progress Chapter presents information on the Military Components—the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Logistics Agency (DLA)—as well as the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) program. The Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) does not have a section in this chapter, as DTRA's environmental restoration program only includes one installation. Each section provides a brief background on the Component, highlights the Component's environmental restoration program progress during Fiscal Year (FY) 2003, and discusses future challenges and goals. A discussion of FY2003 site status, progress made toward DoD's program goals, and Component initiatives and program improvements is provided for both the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) at active and base realignment and closure (BRAC) installations. Funding profiles and trends are also presented for each Component's environmental restoration program.

In addition to the progress presented in this chapter, stories highlighting innovations or improvements that led to outstanding program progress in FY2003 can be found for each Component on the Web site for the FY2003 DERP Annual Report to Congress. Also available

through the Web site are Component-specific "quick fact" sheets highlighting program achievements and site status.

FY2003 DERP Annual Report to Congress Web site:

http://63.88.245.60/DERPARC\_FY03





Fiscal Year 2003

# **ARMY**

Fiscal Year 2003 (FY2003) was a significant year for the Army's Environmental Restoration Program (ERP). On October 1, 2002, the Army established the Installation Management Agency (IMA), under the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM), to provide command and control of all Army garrisons and installation management services. Garrison commanders now report to the IMA regional directors rather than through major commands as they have in the past. Consolidating environmental programs within the ACSIM has enabled the Army to better standardize program funding levels. The ACSIM now centrally manages the Army's ERP, with the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment (ASA(I&E)) providing policy and oversight. Figure 40 outlines the hierarchy for the ERP within the Department of the Army.




FIGURE 40: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

#### Site Status

The Army continues making progress in successfully cleaning up sites and ensuring land is ready for reuse. Commitment to protecting human health and the environment remains the primary focus of the Army's ERP. In FY2003, the Army focused on completing all response action sites in the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) and identifying sites to be included in the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP).




#### Installation Restoration Program Site Status

The Army currently has 10,367 sites in the IRP at active installations, an increase of 17 sites from FY2002. The Army is addressing environmental restoration activity at 1,899 IRP sites at Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) installations, a decrease of 2 sites from the previous year. IRP site status at active and BRAC installations is shown in Figures 41 and 42.

#### Military Munitions Response Program Site Status

In the MMRP, the Army is planning munitions response activities for 383 sites at active installations, an increase of 278 from FY2002. The Army established site-level data for an additional 37 percent of its MMRP inventory in FY2003, resulting in the increased number of sites. As of the end of FY2003, the Army had identified site-level data for 52 percent of its MMRP inventory.

There are 177 MMRP sites at BRAC installations, an increase of 119 from the previous year. This increase is a result of transferring these previously identified munitions response sites that are known or suspected to contain unexploded ordnance (UXO) to sites identified in the Phase 3 Range Inventory for tracking consistency. The munitions response sites, which were formerly listed as UXO sites in the Army's environmental restoration database, were closed and were established as new sites when data was imported from the Army Range Inventory Database.



Active and BRAC MMRP Site Status

Response Complete	124
Investigation Underway or Planned	416
Cleanup Underway	20
LTM Underway**	18
Total MMRP Siles	560

<sup>\*</sup>Remedy in Place (RIP) includes sites where remedial action operations are underway.

# **Progress Toward Program Goals**


The Army is focused on achieving program completion. In the IRP, both the active and BRAC installations continue to progress toward completion of restoration activities in a cost-effective manner. In the MMRP, the Army is focused on making progress toward completing investigations.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Long-term management (LTM) occurs at a subset of the sites that have acheived response complete.



#### **Installation Restoration Program Goals**


The Army projects meeting the FY2014 IRP goal of having all sites at active installations achieve remedy in place/response complete (RIP/RC). The Army also expects meeting the FY2011 goal of achieving RIP/RC at all medium relative-risk sites. However, the Army will not meet the interim goal of having all high relative-risk sites at RIP or RC by FY2007. In FY2003, 320 IRP sites achieved RIP or RC, including 243 at active installations. Ten active installations achieved RIP or RC at all sites. The relative-risk pie charts in Figures 43 and 44 illustrate that the Army has made significant progress in reducing the number of sites of all categories that need to be addressed.



\*The Not Required category includes sites that have already acheived RIP or RC.

In FY2003, 77 BRAC IRP sites achieved RIP or RC and 5 BRAC installations achieved RIP/RC. Current projections show that 58 BRAC sites at 11 installations will not achieve RIP/RC by FY2005. The bar charts in Figures 45 and 46 show the status of active and BRAC installations in achieving RIP/RC.


#### FIGURE 45: ARMY ACTIVE INSTALLATIONS ACHIEVING FINAL RIP OR RC AT ALL IRP SITES (Cumulative and projected, FY1990 through completion).



\*Excludes MMRP Sites

#### FIGURE 46: ARMY BRAC INSTALLATIONS ACHIEVING FINAL RIP OR RC AT ALL IRP SITES (Cumulative and projected, FY1990 through completion)

Total Installations = 119\*



\*Excludes locations without environmental restoration sites.

Fiscal Year



#### Military Munitions Response Program Objectives

The Army progressed as planned for a December 2003 completion of its Phase 3 MMRP Inventory of non-operational ranges. By the end of FY2003, the Army had identified 383 nonoperational ranges and defense sites with UXO, discarded military muntions, or munitions constituents, representing 52 percent of the inventory. This inventory will fulfill the requirements for the preliminary assessment (PA) phase.

In addition to continuing the Phase 3 Inventory, the Army began site inspections this year at 11 active installations. At BRAC installations, 35 investigations were underway and two sites completed remediation efforts.

# **Program Initiatives and Improvements**

The Army continues to seek the most efficient and cost-effective strategies for achieving program completion. In April 2003, the ASA(I&E) approved the first update of an Army cleanup strategy in over 10 years, and the Army produced a plan to execute the strategy. Both are available online at the ACSIM Web site. A major component of the strategic plan is implementing performance-based contracting. The Army awarded five performance-based



#### **ACSIM** Web site:

http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsimweb

contracts at active installations in FY2003. Efforts to utilize performance-based contracts will continue over the next several years, with an Army goal to have 50 percent of project funds going toward performance-based contracts by the end of FY2005.

In FY2003, the Army achieved its goal to transfer 100,000 acres of BRAC property. In addition, in September 2003 the Army completed the Department of Defense's (DoD's) first-ever land transfer using the conservation conveyance authority granted to DoD under Public Law 107-314, transferring 57,633 acres at Sierra Army Depot, California, to the Center for Urban Watershed Renewal and the Honey Lake Conservation Team. The Army also executed an environmental services cooperative agreement at Fort McClellan, Alabama which included the first-ever privatization of a UXO cleanup.


# **Funding**

In FY2003, the Army obligated \$394.4 million at active installations. Of this amount, 51 percent of the funds were obligated for cleanup activities and 23 percent went toward investigation activities. The remaining funds were used for remedial action operations (RA-0) and long-term management (LTM) activities, as well as program management. Environmental restoration funding for the IRP is profiled in Figure 47. An additional \$4.7 million of Army Environmental Restoration funds were obligated for the MMRP at active installations. These funds were used for completion of the Phase 3 Range Inventory PAs and the initiation of the site inspections.

For the BRAC program, the Army obligated \$162.8 million in FY2003. Of this amount, 57 percent of the funds were obligated for IRP sites and 21 percent went toward MMRP sites. The remaining funds were obligated for program management and closure-related compliance




FIGURE 47: ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUNDING PROFILE\*
(In millions of dollars)



<sup>\*</sup>Funding shown includes all IRP, MMRP, and management and support costs. Due to rounding, category subtotals may not equal fiscal year totals.

actions. Of the \$92.7 million funds obligated for IRP sites, 72 percent was obligated for investigation activities, 11 percent went toward cleanup, and 17 percent was obligated for RA-O and LTM. Ninety percent of the \$34.3 million obligated for MMRP sites was obligated for cleanup activities. BRAC and active environmental restoration funding trends are illustrated in Figure 48.

FIGURE 48: ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND BRAC ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDING TRENDS





# **Looking Forward**

The Army looks forward to focusing on achieving results in the year ahead. To meet this challenge the Army will ensure that obligated funds result in site closeout by giving priority to installations where performance can be guaranteed or where BRAC property transfer can be expedited. The Army also plans to achieve measurable results by executing the Army Cleanup Strategic Plan that implements performance-based contracts. In the MMRP, the Army is continuing to build the program and complete the Army Range Inventory.

FISCAL YEAR 2003 -


# NAVY/MARINE CORPS

The Department of the Navy (DON) provides the maritime presence that enables the United States to protect vital American interests around the world. This includes force projection, strategic deterrence, crisis response, and humanitarian efforts in support of national security objectives and global interests — both military and environmental. As part of base stewardship, the DON Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) is integral to protecting human health and the environment.

The DON management structure overseeing environmental restoration, as outlined in Figure 49, begins with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment), who sets overall strategy, objectives, and policy. The Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps advocate for resources and conduct detailed oversight to ensure DON goals and objectives are met. The Naval Facilities Engineering Command and its eight Engineering Field Divisions and Activities nationwide execute DON's ERP, including cleanup at Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) installations. DON's organizational structure supports central management and regional execution, resulting in consistency and efficiency that makes the DON program one of the best of its kind in government.

#### Site Status

DON is focused on moving sites through the appropriate environmental restoration phases to complete all cleanup requirements. Many of DON's Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites have progressed to the final cleanup stages of the program, while the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) sites are completing the initial investigation process.





#### **Installation Restoration Program Site Status**

DON currently has an initiative underway to accelerate the restoration or closure of all sites at IRP installations that have only a few, generally less complex sites. This initiative is geared toward closing out the restoration program at these installations. By doing so, DON will avoid the costly overhead associated with maintaining a restoration program at these installations. In Fiscal Year 2003 (FY2003), DON closed out the restoration program at seven installations. Figures 50 and 51 illustrate DON's IRP site status at active and BRAC installations.


#### Active Installation Restoration Program Site Status

DON currently maintains 3,688 active IRP sites, of which 2,551, or 69 percent, have achieved remedy in place/response complete (RIP/RC). DON discovered only 20 new sites in FY2003, continuing the trend of minimal new site discovery.

Through FY2003, DON has completed 600 remedial actions (RAs) with another 101 currently underway. In addition, as of the end of FY2003, DON completed 100 RAs requiring continuing operations to meet remedial objectives. RA operation (RA-O) is currently underway at 200 sites on active IRP installations. DON completed 737 interim remedial actions (IRAs) on 122 installations, with another 77 sites having interim actions underway.

#### **BRAC Installation Restoration Program Site Status**

DON is responsible for 1,027 BRAC IRP sites at 55 installations requiring environmental restoration. DON has completed restoration activities at 84 percent, or 863 of the total sites. Of the remaining 164 sites, DON has completed investigations at 106 sites, and 58 sites have investigations underway.



<sup>\*</sup>Remedy in place (RIP) includes sites where remedial action operations are underway.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Long-term management (LTM) occurs at a subset of the sites that have acheived response complete.

.As of FY2003, DON has completed 291 IRAs at 42 installations, with another 14 IRAs underway. By the end of FY2003, DON met the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act requirements for transfer at 142,321 acres of BRAC IRP property. DON continues to use the early transfer authority (ETA) process to expedite the transfer of property at locations such as the Naval Training Center in Orlando, Florida where three acres of BRAC property were transferred in less than two months.

#### Military Munitions Response Program Site Status


The DON has identified a total of 225 sites potentially requiring a military munitions response, with 206 of these sites located on 53 active installations and another 19 sites located on 6 BRAC installations. DON has completed preliminary assessments (PAs) for 82 sites at 9 installations. PAs are underway at 31 active and 5 BRAC installations. DON expects to meet the Department of Defense's (DoDs) near-term MMRP goal of completing PAs for all known MMRP sites by the end of 2007.

# **Progress Toward Program Goals**

DON's implementation of the IRP addresses the environmental impacts of hazardous substances remaining from past practices at DON sites. The considerable size of DON's ERP requires extensive resources, comprehensive planning, and rigorous oversight. To keep the program on track and measure its progress, DON utilizes DoD's performance goals for IRP and MMRP sites. The ERP goals focus on acheiving RIP and completing necessary cleanup requirements, while the MMRP objectives focus on completing investigations.

#### **Installation Restoration Program Goals**

DON's approach to meeting DoD's goals and priorities is risk-management based. This approach considers site risk, as assigned through DoD's Relative Risk Site Evaluation framework, as well as legal requirements, economic considerations, and stakeholder concerns. DON's risk-management philosophy also considers expediting the restoration of BRAC property slated for reuse. Figures 52 and 53 illustrate the relative risk ranking for DON's active and BRAC sites in progress.



\* Not Required includes sites that have already achieved RIP or RC.

DoD's and DoN's IRP goals for active installations include achieving RIP/RC at all high relative-risk sites by the end of FY2007, all medium relative-risk sites by the end of FY2011, and all low relative-risk sites by the end of FY2014. During FY2003, DON made considerable progress toward achieving these goals by reaching RIP/RC at 128 sites at active installations, of which 65 sites were high relative-risk. This exceeded DON's goal of achieving RIP/RC at 105 active installation sites in FY2003. As of FY2003, DON accomplished RIP/RC status at 69 percent of all active IRP sites, and reached RIP/RC at 63 percent, of its high relative-risk sites.

DON is also advancing toward DoD's goal of achieving 100 percent RIP/RC at all BRAC installations by FY2005. During FY2003 alone, DON achieved RIP/RC at 45 BRAC sites. By the end of FY2003, 88 percent of all BRAC sites had reached RIP/RC. DON achieved RIP/RC at all IRP sites on 23 out of 55 DON BRAC installations. DON projects that 93 percent of all IRP sites will reach RIP/RC by the end of FY2005, nearing the DoD goal of 100 percent. After FY2005, DON expects to have 69 IRP sites at 20 BRAC installations remaining from the total 1,027 IRP sites at 55 BRAC installations. Of these 20 installations, it is projected that eight installations will have only one site left. Figures 54 and 55 show the status of active and BRAC installations with all sites in RIP/RC.


By restoring BRAC property, DON has made 142,321 acres environmentally suitable for transfer. DON projects that over 90 percent of its BRAC acreage will be environmentally suitable for transfer by the end of FY2005.


#### Military Munitions Response Program Objectives

DON has been actively addressing DoD's MMRP objectives, including updating the MMRP site-level inventory, furthering MMRP program build, and accomplishing investigations and cleanup at MMRP sites. DON has completed PAs for MMRP sites at 31 installations through the end of FY2003, with plans to complete PAs at 13 additional installations by FY2005. In addition, the Marine Corps has already completed MMRP site PAs at all nine of their installations. By the end of FY2003, DON achieved RIP/RC at 3 of its 19 BRAC MMRP sites. As PAs are completed, DON will begin to move forward with site inspections at MMRP sites.

FIGURE 54: NAVY ACTIVE INSTALLATIONS
ACHIEVING FINAL RIP OR RC AT ALL IRP SITES
(Cumulative and projected, FY1990 through completion)

FIGURE 55: NAVY BRAC INSTALLATIONS
ACHIEVING FINAL RIP OR RC AT ALL IRP SITES
(Cumulative and projected, FY1993 through completion)





Excludes locations without environmental restoration sites.



# Program Initiatives and Improvements


DON's ERP continually seeks to match the type of work to be performed with the most costeffective contractual vehicle, while addressing congressional concerns pertaining to contract types. This acquisition strategy includes increased use of fixed-price contracts, a continued trend toward increased small-business participation, and expedited closeout of contract task orders.

One of DON's program highlights for FY2003 is the completion of the first-ever early transfer at a non-BRAC installation. Under the ETA, DON used an environmental services cooperative agreement to transfer cleanup responsibility at Naval Communication Telecommunication Installation Stockton, California, to the new landowner, the Port of Stockton. Further details about this success can be found in the Defense Environmental Restoration Program Chapter.

Also in FY2003, DON developed and implemented its Optimization Policy that will optimize RA system selection, operations, and monitoring to reduce cleanup costs.

# **Funding**

In FY2003, DON obligated \$255.5 million for environmental restoration work at active installations, including \$8 million for MMRP activities. The FY2004 funding level is projected to be \$254.9 million, and the FY2005 funding level is projected to be \$266.8 million, including \$8 million in FY2004 and \$16 million in FY2005 for MMRP activities. Figure 56 illustrates DON's Environmental Restoration funding profile for FY2002 through FY2005.



<sup>\*</sup>Funding shown includes all IRP, MMRP, and management and support costs. Due to rounding, category subtotals may not equal fiscal year totals.

DON obligated approximately 66 percent of Environmental Restoration funds in FY2003 on design work, interim or final cleanup actions, and operations and maintenance, spending only 34 percent of funding on investigation activity and management. DON expects these proportions to remain the same in FY2004. Over 90 percent of the project funds were spent on high relative-risk projects, including RA-O and long-term management actions.

DON's obligations for environmental restoration work at BRAC installations totaled \$462.2 million in FY2003. The planned investment levels for DON BRAC environmental restoration in FY2004 and FY2005 are \$101.2 million and \$101.7 million, respectively. DON active and BRAC funding trends are detailed below in Figure 57.

DON has continued to reduce both active and BRAC installation IRP cost-to-complete (CTC) estimates. While overall program costs continue to decrease, site-specific cost increases occurred at five BRAC installations—Hunter's Point, South Weymouth, Adak, Mare Island, and Orlando—due to the discovery of greater contamination than originally anticipated. To ensure DON CTC estimates continue to decrease according to work requirements, CTC validation efforts at active installations, based on a technical review of remedies and costs, will be performed in FY2004.

The total cost of completing the ERP at both active and BRAC installations for the DON is now estimated at \$3.26 billion, not including program management costs of \$433 million. MMRP completion costs are estimated at \$437.3 million.

# **Looking Forward**

DON continues to make substantial progress toward completing the ERP in the face of complex challenges directly associated with DON's mission and related operational factors. DON is ontarget to meet DoD's environmental restoration goal of completing all IRP restoration by 2014.




FIGURE 57: NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND BRAC ENVIRONMENTAL
FUNDING TRENDS

# AIR FORCE

The Air Force Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) directs restoration activities at Air Force installations. These installations are divided into active installations managed by the Headquarters U.S. Air Force's Environmental Restoration Branch, and installations that have been closed or realigned in accordance with the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Act and are managed by the Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA). The organizational chart in Figure 58 portrays the structure of Air Force's environmental organization. These offices work together to comprehensively address environmental restoration issues within the Air Force and continually refine and improve the Air Force's ERP.




FIGURE 58: DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE ORGANIZATION CHART

#### Site Status

The Air Force continued to perform cleanup and successfully resolve complicated environmental issues in Fiscal Year 2003 (FY2003). The Air Force initiated a transformation in its ERP to a broader performance-based management (PBM) approach that focuses the measure of success on results as opposed to processes. This illustrates the Air Force's commitment to meeting current and future mission requirements while reducing environmental liabilities. By redefining its program in this way, the Air Force has taken significant steps toward meeting the President's Management Agenda — to achieve "immediate, concrete, and measurable results in the near term"— while improving its ability to address environmental restoration responsibilities related to protecting human health and the environment.

<sup>\*</sup> In this diagram, all branches above, and including, the Environmental Restoration Branch and Air Force Real Property Agency are responsible for policy, guidance, and oversight. All branches shown below these branches are responsible for program execution.



#### **Installation Restoration Program Site Status**


The Air Force is using performance-based contracts and guaranteed fixed-price remediation contracts to maximize efficiency and accelerate environmental cleanup. In FY2003, such contracts accounted for 20 percent of AFRPA's total program dollars. AFRPA plans to increase the number of performance-based contracts it issues to 60 percent in FY2004. Performance-based program goals founded on cleanup action effectiveness, technology and private sector benchmarks, and land transfer rates are under development for FY2004. In addition, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Installations, Environment and Logistics has established the goal that ten percent of Environmental Restoration projects in each Major Command be executed through performance-based contracts by the third quarter of FY2003 and 20 percent by the third quarter of FY2004.

#### Active Installation Restoration Program Site Status

The Air Force Civil Engineer's Environmental Management Division manages the cleanup activities at 272 active installations for 5,159 Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites. The Air Force has achieved response complete (RC) status at 2,906 of these sites, or 56 percent. A total of 1,974 sites at active installations achieved RC directly from site investigation processes; the remaining sites achieved RC or no further action (NFA) status as a result of completing restoration activities. As of the end of FY2003, response actions continued at 2,253 sites. See Figure 59 for the Air Force active IRP site status, illustrating 1,401 sites under investigation and 852 undergoing remedial action.

#### BRAC Installation Restoration Program Site Status

AFRPA manages the cleanup activities at 30 of the Air Force's 32 BRAC installations for 1,671 sites; Figure 60 illustrates the Air Force's BRAC IRP site status. The majority of these sites, 75



<sup>\*</sup>Remedy in Place (RIP) includes sites where remedial action operations are underway.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Long-term management (LTM) occurs at a subset of the sites that have acheived response complete.



percent, have completed all investigation activities. The Air Force has achieved RC status at 1,027 of these sites, or 61 percent. A total of 780 sites at BRAC installations achieved RC directly from site investigation processes; the remaining sites achieved RC or NFA status as a result of completing restoration activities. Of the remaining 472 sites that have yet to achieve remedy in place (RIP), 289 are associated with the former McClellan Air Force Base, which is currently scheduled to reach the last RIP milestone in FY2015.

#### Military Munitions Response Program Site Status

As of the end of FY2003, the Air Force identified 261 Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) sites at active installations; investigation and cleanup cost estimates and Risk Assessment Codes were updated for each of these sites. The Air Force will initiate preliminary assessment at each of these MMRP sites beginning in FY2005. As of the end of FY2003, the Air Force had not formally identified any BRAC sites requiring response under the MMRP. The Air Force is evaluating the installations in its BRAC property portfolio to identify any qualifying sites based on available documentation.


# **Progress Toward Program Goals**

The Air Force continued to make progress toward accomplishing program goals in the IRP and MMRP during FY2003. These program goals focus on getting remedies in place and completing needed cleanup requirements at sites.

# **Installation Restoration Program Goals**

Total Sites: 5,159

At its active installations, the Air Force projects that 96 percent of high relative-risk sites will achieve RIP/RC by the end of FY2007, 92 percent of medium relative-risk sites will achieve RIP/RC by FY2011, and 91 percent of remaining sites will achieve RIP/RC by FY2014. FY2003 relative-risk status for active and BRAC installations are shown in Figures 61 and 62. The number of Air Force sites in the high relative-risk category has been decreasing consistently since FY1996.



\*The Not Required category includes sites that have already acheived RIP or RC, as well as IRP sites requiring only military munitions response or building demolition and debris removal.

Total Sites: 1,671



To date, approximately 57 percent of all Air Force IRP sites have achieved RC status and approximately 31 percent of all Air Force installations (94 out of 302 installations) have achieved RIP/RC at all IRP sites. Figures 63 and 64 illustrate the progress of active and BRAC installations toward achieving final RIP/RC.

#### Military Munitions Response Program Objectives

The Air Force is implementing a PBM approach in the development of the MMRP. Air Force reasoned that sites with similar environmental and explosive safety hazards see similar response strategies selected, and those responses have measurable and comparable factors, such as costs and duration, that can be used to monitor performance. PBM execution will begin with a focus on small arms ranges. Rather than the traditional process-intensive, open-ended investigation and analysis of multiple response alternatives, the Air Force will mandate standard approaches to investigation and remediation using innovative contracting strategies, such as guaranteed fixed-price remediation contracts, and best available technologies to facilitate and increase the efficiency of the response across the Air Force.

# **Program Initiatives and Improvements**

In response to an FY2003 management review, the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force formed an Environmental Restoration Tiger Team (ERTT), composed of key staff from all levels of the active and BRAC programs, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Air Force restoration programs. The ERTT met several times in the latter half of FY2003 and recommended policy changes in several areas, including: program oversight, project management team continuity, delegation of Record of Decision (ROD) signature authority, and cost to complete (CTC) estimation. As a result of this effort and follow-on program review, the Air Force CTC estimates were reduced by over \$675 million between FY2002 and FY2003.

In FY2003, the Air Force worked closely with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to convert the execution and oversight of land use controls to a results-oriented basis. The resulting agreement will streamline RODs and enhance the Air Force's and EPA's efforts to emphasize performance over process.






FIGURE 64: AIR FORCE BRAC INSTALLATIONS ACHIEVING FINAL RIP OR RC AT ALL IRP SITES (Cumulative and projected, FY1999 through completion)






\*Excludes MMRP and Building Demolition and Debris Removal sites.



# **Funding**

As the ERP matures and technology improves, experience guides Air Force use of its funding. The Air Force's ability to effectively plan and conduct cleanup activities depends on receiving predictable, stable funding from year to year. Technology and process baselining with the private sector, utilization of performance-based contracts and program goals, and renewed central oversight of the cleanup programs are central tenets of the Air Force's strategy to balance new cleanup mission requirements with finite resources.


The Air Force obligated \$511.2 million for installation environmental restoration activities in FY2003. Active obligated funds totaled \$387.8 million, while BRAC obligated funds totaled \$125.4 million. Figure 65 illustrates Air Force's planned and obligated funding for active installations. As the program continues to progress, a larger percentage of funds will be spent on cleanup activities, rather than on investigation. The Air Force devoted significant funding in FY2003 to emerging or unregulated issues such as munitions and radiological materials. The Air Force plans to fund \$382.5 million and \$397.5 million for emerging or unregulated issues in FY2004 and FY2005, respectively.




<sup>\*</sup>Funding shown includes all IRP, MMRP, and management and support costs. Due to rounding, category subtotals may not equal fiscal year totals.

Appropriate funding is essential for the Air Force to reduce the CTC site restorations and future environmental liability. As of the end of FY2003, the Air Force's active site-level CTC was \$4.9 billion, a reduction of \$508 million from FY2002. In addition, Air Force BRAC reduced its site-level CTC by \$167 million in FY2003. The funding trends for active and BRAC are shown in Figure 66.







# **Looking Forward**

While the Air Force conducts cleanup activities based on the best available science and uses the best practices available, new challenges constantly arise. New and unregulated contaminants, uncertain regulatory requirements, and new programs such as the MMRP will continue to pose significant challenges. Performance-based management of these resources, according to the President's Management Agenda, is the way forward to balance Air Force operational requirements with the inherent core competencies of human health and environmental protection.

FISCAL YEAR 2003 -

56

# DLA

The Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) is a combat support agency responsible for providing the Department of Defense (DoD) and other federal agencies a variety of logistics, acquisition, and technical services, including: inventory management; procurement, warehousing, and distribution of spare parts, food, clothing, medical supplies, construction materials, and fuel; and reutilization and disposal of material that is obsolete, worn out, or no longer needed.

DLA has a staff of 319 environmental specialists located throughout the world, ensuring that the agency's activities are conducted in full compliance with applicable environmental requirements. Two hundred sixty-one DLA staff members work on Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service missions, which give the agency special opportunities to provide services and support that are critical to the environmental programs of DLA's Military Component customers. Under DLA's Defense National Stockpile Program, unique environmental issues are addressed in relation to storage, disposal, and sale of materials such as asbestos, lead, mercury, and thorium nitrate. DLA is also involved in the environmental restoration process at active third-party sites where contamination has resulted from improper disposal or transfer of DoD hazardous wastes.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers assists the DLA restoration program with administrative contracting support and provides technical oversight at several key DLA locations. Other Component offices, such as the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE), also assist the DLA restoration program by providing peer reviews of DLA remediation systems through implementation of a remedial process optimization (RPO) program. The agency's organizational structure is illustrated below in Figure 67.

Director
Defense Logistics Agency

Director
DLA Support Services

Staff Director
(Environmental and Safety
Directorate)

Primary Level Field Activities
(Environmental Offices)

Command
Program Management

FIGURE 67: DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY ORGANIZATIONAL CHART



#### Site Status


DLA has 553 Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites as part of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program: 389 active IRP sites at 17 installations, and 164 IRP sites at DLA's 2 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) installations. Figures 68 and 69 show the status of DLA's active and BRAC IRP sites. To date, DLA has identified no Military Munitions Response Program sites.

#### **Active Installation Restoration Program Site Status**

Currently, DLA has 47 restoration actions underway or planned for the future. Investigations have been completed at 370 sites, and 19 are underway. DLA has completed remedial action-construction and remedial action-operation (RA-0) at 163 sites, with 47 sites at active installations with cleanup activities currently underway or planned for the future. Interim actions (IAs) were completed for 65 sites at 5 installations. DLA has achieved response complete (RC) through investigation activities at 190 active installation sites and through cleanup activities at 133 active installation sites. DLA currently has 22 sites in long-term management (LTM), with 28 additional sites planned for LTM in the future.

#### **BRAC Installation Restoration Program Site Status**

Four DLA installations were closed or realigned from the Fiscal Year 1993 (FY1993) and FY1995 BRAC rounds. At two of these locations, the Former Defense Electronics Supply Center and the Defense Distribution Depot Ogden (DDOU), all sites have achieved remedy in place (RIP) or RC and were transferred for any follow-on actions to the Air Force and the Army, respectively. Of the 164 sites at DLA's two remaining BRAC installations, restoration work is complete at 130 sites. Investigations have been completed at 147 sites and are planned or underway at 17 sites. IAs were completed at 10 sites and 3 are underway. The transfer of DDOU to the Army resulted in a decrease of DLA's BRAC site count from 267 to 164, a reduction of 103 sites.




\*Remedy in place (RIP) includes sites where RA-O are underway.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Long-term management (LTM) occurs at a subset of the sites that have acheived response complete.



# **Progress Toward Program Goals**

DLA continued to make significant progress toward reaching DoD's management goals for completing environmental restoration actions at sites on active and BRAC installations. In accordance with DoD goals, DLA applies the Relative Risk Site Evaluation (RRSE) to expedite cleanup and reduce risk to human health and the environment. Figures 70 and 71 show progress made at DLA sites based on the RRSE.




Progress is also demonstrated as sites move through the investigation process and into cleanup phases. A designation of RIP indicates that the selected remedy is in place and operating properly and successfully, while RC is achieved when all cleanup objectives for the site are met. DLA has achieved RIP/RC at 5 of 17 active installations, or 29 percent, and 1 out of 2 remaining BRAC installations, or 50 percent, have achieved RIP/RC. This does not include 1 BRAC installation that was transferred out of DLA last year.

By the end of FY2003, DLA had only 5 high relative-risk sites remaining at active installations. DLA expects to achieve RIP or RC at all high relative-risk sites well in advance of the DoD

management goal of FY2007. DLA is also ahead of schedule to complete all restoration requirements for the two remaining active installation goals, to achieve RIP/RC at all medium relative-risk sites by FY2011 and all low relative-risk sites by FY2014. DLA is on track to achieve RIP/RC at all remaining BRAC sites by FY2005. The bar chart illustrated in Figures 72 shows DLA's progress toward final RIP/RC at active installations.

# FIGURE 72: DLA ACTIVE INSTALLATIONS ACHIEVING FINAL RIP OR RC (Cumulative and projected, FY2000 through completion)






# **Program Initiatives and Improvements**

DLA identified significant optimization opportunities at each of the installations evaluated under the RPO program. By implementing remedial process optimization recommendations, DLA is improving the effectiveness of remediation systems and reducing overall cleanup costs. In FY2003, DLA developed an exit strategies document, in conjunction with AFCEE, that changes DLA's approach to cleanup. Under the new exit strategy, DLA's Records of Decision (RODs) will now contain contingencies allowing for process corrections during cleanup. This strategy will provide the installations and stakeholders with a road map clearly defining when ROD cleanup goals and objectives are met. The agency also recently embarked on a performance-based contracting approach that provides incentives for contractors to complete projects faster and reach site closeout sooner. These initiatives highlight the success of DLA's cleanup program.

# **Funding**

DLA obligated a total of \$18.8 million in FY2003 for active installation restoration, with \$12.6 million for cleanup activities and \$4.3 million for investigation actions. The remaining funding was obligated for remedial design and program management. DLA continues to keep management costs low, at roughly eight percent of total dollars spent. Planned funding for active installations is \$19.3 million and \$19.1 million for FY2004 and FY2005, respectively. The pie charts in Figure 73 exhibit DLA's profile for obligated and planned funds.

For the BRAC program, DLA obligated \$10.2 million during FY2003, of which \$5.9 million was obligated for cleanup, \$2.7 million was obligated for remedial design, and \$1.6 million was obligated for program management. DLA anticipates obligating funding amounts of \$9.9 million in FY2004 for BRAC installation activities.




<sup>\*</sup>Funding shown includes all IRP and management and support costs. Due to rounding, category subtotals may not equal fiscal year totals.



DLA continues to receive stable funding for both active and BRAC environmental restoration, and does not anticipate any requirement for increased funding. In fact, as a result of performance-based contracting and the exit strategy approach, DLA expects a decrease in required program funding and overall program length. DLA's environmental restoration funding trends are displayed in Figure 74.

Cost-to-complete estimates and site progress are based on the reasonable expectation that adequate funding will be provided. Without such assurances, current and planned schedules cannot be realized, resulting in extended cleanup schedules, stretching over additional years at additional costs. At BRAC installations, a lack of funding would extend cleanup time requirements and inhibit property transfer for reuse, slowing job creation and economic recovery in the areas most affected by base closings.



Fiscal Year

# **Looking Forward**

DLA expects to continue making significant progress in its environmental restoration program over the next several years, including the achievement of site completion at 96 percent of all sites by FY2010. DLA looks forward to the successful implementation of the new exit strategies and performance-based contracting initiatives in the coming years and the successful completion of DLA environmental restoration program activities ahead of schedule.

<sup>\*</sup>Prior year unobligated balance available for execution in FY05.



# **FUDS**

The goal of the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) program is to reduce risk to human health and the environment resulting from past Department of Defense (DoD) activities at properties that were formerly owned, leased, or possessed by, or otherwise under the jurisdiction of DoD or its Components.

The Army acts as the executive agent for the FUDS program, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) executes the program through its divisions and districts. USACE sets priorities for the FUDS program based on an evaluation of relative risk and other factors, such as legal agreements,

stakeholder concerns, and economic considerations. USACE headquarters is responsible for the FUDS program management and execution. The FUDS mission within USACE is executed by the field organization, which consists of seven geographic military divisions; 22 military districts, with necessary support from civil works districts: one hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste (HTRW) center of expertise; and one ordnance and explosives center of expertise. A USACE district commander serves as each property's installation commander, executing environmental restoration projects and fulfilling associated responsibilities, since DoD no longer owns or uses the FUDS properties. Figure 75 outlines the hierarchy for the FUDS program.


#### Site Status

USACE must evaluate information about the origin and extent of contamination, land transfer issues, past and present property ownership, and program policies before a property is considered eligible for the FUDS program. At FUDS-eligible properties, USACE conducts environmental restoration

activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). New properties and sites are continually being discovered by USACE and added to the FUDS program.

USACE has identified 9,541 properties for potential inclusion in the program, with 2,939, or 31 percent, of those properties currently FUDS-eligible and requiring response actions. USACE continues to emphasize project execution, FUDS property restoration, and active stakeholder involvement in the environmental restoration process. At eligible FUDS properties, environmental restoration procedures are similar to those at active DoD installations.

FIGURE 75: FUDS PROGRAM HIERARCHY CHART






#### **Installation Restoration Program Site Status**

The scope and magnitude of the FUDS program are significant, with 9,541 properties identified for potential inclusion in the program, as shown in Figure 76. Figure 77 illustrates that as of the end of Fiscal Year 2003 (FY2003), 9,266 properties have been evaluated and USACE has determined that no response is required at 6,327 of those properties.


USACE currently has 3,091 Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites in the FUDS program, a decrease of 35 sites from FY2002. Sixty-one percent, or 1,871 sites, have achieved remedy in place (RIP) or response complete (RC) status. Figure 78 illustrates IRP site status. USACE continues evaluating potentially FUDS-eligible sites as well as completing investigation and cleanup requirements to meet DoD management goals.

#### FIGURE 76: FUDS PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY STATUS OF POTENTIAL FUDS PROPERTIES (As of September 30, 2003)



Total Properties = 9,541

# FIGURE 77: FUDS RESPONSE ACTION STATUS AT EVALUATED FUDS PROPERTIES (As of September 30, 2003)



Total Properties = 9,266

#### Military Munitions Response Program Site Status

USACE also evaluates Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) category sites for risks to human safety. MMRP assessments consist of a hazard severity assessment and a hazard probability assessment; both are based on the best-available information from archive search reports (ASRs), explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) incidence reports, field observations, interviews, and physical site measurements. Of the 1,771 eligible MMRP sites in the FUDS program, 807 have already achieved RC status, as shown in Figure 79. USACE has assigned Risk Assessment Codes for 791 of the remaining 964 MMRP sites to indicate their potential hazard to human safety.


# **Progress Toward Program Goals**

USACE has identified 9,541 properties for potential inclusion in the program, and continues identifying new FUDS-eligible properties as they become known. Despite the addition of new properties, the FUDS program continues to make progress toward reaching DoD management goals. USACE is committed to meeting these goals in a cost-effective manner.




#### FIGURE 78: FUDS IRP SITES STATUS

(As of September 30, 2003)



# FIGURE 79: FUDS MMRP SITES STATUS (As of September 30, 2003)




\*RIP includes sites where remedial action operations are underway.

#### **Installation Restoration Program Goals**

New sites are continually being discovered and added to the FUDS program. USACE strives to evaluate as many HTRW sites as possible, including containerized HTRW (CON/HTRW), to assess

the relative risk to human health and the environment. Of the 3,091 FUDS sites, 67 percent, or 2,058 sites, do not require a relative-risk ranking. The relative-risk ranking chart in Figure 80 illustrates USACE's progress in reducing risk at FUDS sites as of the end of FY2003. USACE uses ratings of relative risk to human health, human safety, and the environment for HTRW and MMRP projects. along with other management factors, such as stakeholder concerns, to aid in sequencing work during FUDS planning, programming, budgeting, and project execution. Project execution figures for FY2003 demonstrate that the FUDS program continues to make significant progress. As of the end of FY2003, 1.871 FUDS sites had reached the RIP/RC milestone. Eighty-one percent of FUDS properties are predicted to achieve RIP/RC by the DoD goal of FY2020, as shown in Figure 81.

FIGURE 80: FUDS RELATIVE RISK RANKING



\*Excludes munitions and explosives of concern sites.

\*\*\*The Not Required category includes sites that have already acheived RIP or RC, as well as sites requiring only building demolition and debris removal or potentially responsible party actions.

#### Military Munitions Response Program Objectives

In FY2003, USACE completed its initial inventory and cost estimates for FUDS MMRP sites for unexploded ordnance, discarded military munitions, and munitions constituents. In April 2003, USACE completed geographic maps of all FUDS properties and specific areas in the initial inventory that may require a munitions response. These maps outline each of the MMRP areas contained in the initial inventory.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Long-term management (ETM) occurs at a subset of the sites that have acheived response complete.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Includes CON/HTRW sites.